THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume X APRIL 1924 Number 2

AN IDEAL HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN SPEECH

LOUSENE G. ROUSSEAU
Western State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Michigan

FIND a school administered by a wise and far-sighted educator, fully cognisant of the necessity and value of sound speech education; put that subject on a par with every other subject in the curriculum, with an identity entirely distinct; accord it full credit in proportion to the number of class hours of instruction; assign to it a classroom which is not only sunny and cheerful, but also equipped with movable chairs for the pupils and a small stage for practice, and withal as nearly sound-proof as possible—and you have an excellent beginning. Then find a teacher who has plenty of tact and patience, a sympathetic understanding of adolescent problems, an appealing personality, an enthusiasm for teaching, and a sound, scientific training in speech education—a teacher who has a pleasant, well-modulated voice, and who exemplifies the best of speech standards. Put this teacher and this school together, limit your classes to about fifteen students, and you are then ready to talk about your "ideal high school course in speech."

At present, with an over-crowded and top-heavy curriculum and an appalling lack of properly trained teachers, the most we can do is to struggle forward, making the best of the situation we are asked to meet, and endeavoring to approach as closely as possible what we believe to be the ideal course. Some of the points mentioned above—points, by the way, upon which speech teachers are

generally agreed—must be accepted by a majority of our high school administrators before it is possible for speech education to fill its proper sphere.

First of all, the "ideal high school course in speech" must be taught in the Department of Speech, as a course in Speech Education, and by a specially trained speech teacher; and not, as the National Council of Teachers of English have resolved, "in the regular English courses of instruction, in the regular English classes, and by regular English teachers."[1] Why should such a wide-spread misconception persist and flourish so long? Because there is a close correlation between English and Speech, does that necessitate the conclusion that they are therefore identical, and that any English teacher is consequently equipped to teach Speech? Such a conclusion is simply not warranted by the facts. With Professor O'Neill, we "object to the assumption that anyone who is competent to teach English is therefore necessarily competent to teach Speech."[2]

Speech, considered apart from other subjects, is not only a discipline, but the most liberal of all disciplines. What other branch of learning is so universal or so necessary to our happiness? The facts and principles which constitute the fundamentals of Speech are just as true in France or Spain or Zanzibar as they are in London or Kalamazoo. They constitute a separate body of knowledge which needs to be studied deliberately and in a scientific spirit before it can be taught by anyone. The day has passed when, as Dr. Blanton says, "Anyone with a good singing or speaking voice was considered . . . to be equipped *ipso facto* to teach the science of how to sing or how to speak;" or even when a mere elocutionist can hope to do work of academic rank. Rees Edgar Tulloss, President of Wittenberg College, has said that "the study of Public Speaking is inevitably a discipline. It is a discipline which serves the students in all studies and in all relationships of life. Properly taught, by scholarly teachers, who make stern demand for earnest work on the part of every pupil, Public Speaking has the possibility of becoming one of the most vital studies in the

[1] Report of the Oral Expression Committee of the Chicago High School, QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION, November, 1919.

[2] *Aims and Standards in Speech Education*, QUARTERLY JOURNAL, November, 1920.

college curriculum.'' The statement is equally true of the high school curriculum. Unless Speech is recognized as dignified enough and worthy enough to stand on its own feet, it has no place there at all.

This should not, however, be interpreted to mean that Speech Education must be kept completely separated from every other subject, for that would be as disastrous as the other extreme. It is essential that the work of the Speech class should be correlated with the work in all other courses—History, Civics, and Science, as well as English, all having the same common ideals of education and consequently working toward the same end. But the Speech work must be accorded recognition as an independent academic discipline.

What shall we teach our high school boys and girls in the ''ideal course in speech?'' Or rather, what shall we emphasize in our teaching?—for we can teach many things incidentally. In the last analysis it is this matter of emphasis which stamps our courses as distinctive.

The question is most easily answered by the process of elimination, enumerating the things we must not emphasize. First of all, we must appreciate the fact that we are conducting a beginning course, and that consequently none of the specialized phases of Speech Education are to be emphasized at the expense of general knowledge and training. Professor Weaver said before the Wisconsin State Teachers' Association two years ago: ''When we put high school pupils into courses in interpretative reading, debating, dramatics, or any other formal type of speaking and reading before we have given them elementary training in Speech, we violate every sound canon of educational practice. It is indefensible pedagogy to begin the study of any subject with its more complex and intricate phases. Our first concern in the high school should be the fundamental principles of Speech, and until a course in the elementary foundation matters of Speech—those facts and principles common to all speaking and reading—has been provided, it is bad practice to offer advanced and specialized courses.''[3]

Furthermore, such a course should not put its emphasis upon training in grammar, usage, rhetoric, and diction. It is not that

[3] *The Content of a High School Course in Speech*, QUARTERLY JOURNAL, February, 1921.

such training is undesirable—far from it! But it does not fall within the peculiar province of the teacher of Speech. It is solely a matter of language, and for that reason should receive its emphasis in the English Department. When a student has stood before his class and "recited" a speech, connecting his sentences properly, using his words correctly, paying attention to unity, coherence, and emphasis, and speaking with clear articulation, distinct enunciation and correct pronunciation, he is still a long way from reaching the best standards in speaking. From our point of view it is infinitely more important that he speak with energy and enthusiasm, holding the attention of the entire class because he is making his subject interesting. What does it matter if he says "want" for "wish," "get" for "become," "start" for "begin," "talk about" for "discuss," "says" for "states?" Mr. Chapel has the sympathy of many of us when he says: "Let him express himself, and time and patience will eradicate the worst faults." The so-called "Better Speech Week" has done much to establish the misconception that speech and language are synonymous. Why not call it, more accurately, "Better Language Week?"

Again, the conscientious teacher of Speech must realize that immediate results cannot fairly be considered a test of the training —some high school principals to the contrary notwithstanding. We cannot take children who have for thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen years, been learning their speech in uncultured homes, on the streets, on the playgrounds, anywhere at all, and in one hour a week for a year, or at best five hours a week for a semester, unmake all these habits of a lifetime, and transform harsh, raucous voices and careless, slovenly language into pleasant, well-modulated voices and beautiful language. It would be a super-human task. To be sure, this would be a very splendid service, and well worth attempting, even though next to impossible in the time allotted to us. But administrators must realize that the boys and girls who are to be thus transformed must be taught the facts and principles underlying all Speech Education, not merely language and voice, before they can rightfully be expected to apply them. Professor Weaver puts the matter very well when he says: "We have meekly accepted the notion that the whole duty of the teacher of Speech is to coach the pupil to read and speak more effectively. This is our greatest potential service, all right, but we should also impart a knowledge of facts and principles as such,

because (1) Improvement in Speech is intimately dependent upon the pupil's ability to criticize his own speech intelligently, and (2) The facts and principles concerning man's highest and finest means of adaptation to his environment are intrinsically as important as facts and principles in any other subject.''

In other words, our first duty in the ''ideal course'' is to bend our energies toward making the pupil an intelligent self-critic, and *then* to work for personal speech betterment.

For such teaching, we need always to hold before us the fundamental concept that speech is first of all a means of communication, and not primarily a means of expression. Speech is social, rather than artistic. It is practically our only means of social adjustment, of getting along with other people, of learning their meanings and making known ours. It is necessarily both visual and auditory. Pantomime and gesture are as essentially speech as voice and language. The subject matter of any fundamental Speech course should be directed toward developing the innate capacities of the pupils, and adjusting them to their environments. As a subject in the high school curriculum it must help to fit pupils to perform adequately the functions of educated members of society. As a social thing and as a liberal discipline, Speech Education must be for the masses, not for the gifted few. The time has passed when we can devote hours to coaching our most brilliant students for exhibition in debate, dramatics, and contests generally, and feel that we have done well when we have carried home a few prizes. When we reach the point where extra-curricular activities are administered as educational agencies for the improvement of speech rather than as ends in themselves, we will be entitled to call ourselves genuine educators—not before. When Speech teachers as well as high school and college administrators are ready to concede this point, Speech Education will have taken a long step toward its goal.

If we are now ready to discuss the actual content of the ''ideal course in Speech,'' to enumerate those ''facts and principles'' so often mentioned, we need only repeat the statement which was so concisely given by Professor Weaver in the address referred to:

Every bit of subject matter which goes into the course should be serviceable for the purpose of giving the pupil a knowledge and a control of his physical instruments of speech. This is our paramount objective and

our supreme service. The content of the course should be of such character as will make it most helpful in attaining the following objectives:

I. Knowledge of:
   1. The general facts concerning the nature and function of speech.
   2. The fundamental requisites of good reading and speaking, which are:
      (a) Physical freedom and readiness for response to thought and feeling.
      (b) Correct and adequate thought and emotional processes.
   3. The functions and interrelations of the following in speech situations:
      (a) Reader or speaker.
      (b) Listener.
      (c) Author, when other than reader or speaker.
      (d) Characters presented in material spoken or read.
   4. Elementary phonetics.
   5. The elementary principles of voice production and control.
   6. Standards for the analysis and appraisal of performance in reading or speaking.

II. Proficiency in:
   1. The controlled use of the vocal apparatus. Diaphragmatic breathing, correctness and precision of utterance, vocal flexibility and responsiveness to thought and feeling.
   2. The controlled use of the muscle systems capable of symbolic and pantomimic action. Muscular relaxation, smoothness of coordination, and responsiveness to thought and feeling.
   3. The controlled use of the total physical equipment as an instrument of communication in reading aloud simple prose and poetry.
   4. The controlled use of the total physical equipment as an instrument of communication in delivering simple original talks.
   5. Intelligent criticism of one's own work and the work of others in reading and speaking.

The National Educational Association has formulated the fundamental aims of the secondary school as health, citizenship, vocational efficiency, and recreation. Is there anything in any of these which is not satisfied, at least partially, by sound Speech Education? Are we not making recreation of any kind more beneficial and more valuable when we attempt to make the boy and girl more social beings? When we work for greater economy of effort, for muscular relaxation, for poise and balance, are we not making it easier for them to fit into a social group, either for recreation or any other purpose? And is their vocal efficiency not tremendously increased when we teach them to remove their inhibitions and develop their self-confidence, so that they will be able to talk more

freely and easily than they otherwise might have done? As for citizenship, if we can arouse in them through class discussions and speeches an active interest in questions of public welfare, and arouse them to a sense of their own responsibility as members of the social group, surely no one could ask for a greater contribution. So far as education for health is concerned, no subject in the entire curriculum—no academic subject, at least—can contribute as much as Speech Education. When the pupil learns the importance of muscular control and muscular relaxation—in a word, of muscular coördination—for speech, his health must necessarily profit. When he has learned the necessity for properly placed, well controlled breathing in speech, his health must necessarily reflect the difference.

Such, then, is our task—the task of those of us who teach Speech, not only in the high schools, but anywhere. And it is a great task, is it not?—worthy of our greatest efforts and our most inspired service.

MEETING THE DEMAND FOR SPOKEN ENGLISH IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

ELIZABETH W. BAKER
Oak Cliff High School, Dallas, Texas

THE teaching of English in high schools is being rapidly transformed. Teachers and school officials are coming to realize that the needs of life are changing, and are adjusting the teaching of the English language to equip their pupils for the conditions which they must meet.

The increase in the number of organizations in modern society, such as social clubs and temporary associations for various civic purposes; and the invention of certain time and labor saving devices, such as the telephone, dictaphone, and radio, have greatly increased the proportion of spoken language used in ordinary social, business, and professional life.

The power to talk well is a great advantage in most occupations, and is in many an imperative necessity. Every one realizes that speaking ability is an important part of the equipment of the lawyer, the doctor, the minister, and the teacher. This is tradi-

tional and established. But it is now generally recognized that the business man or woman also needs to be able to speak well.

When practically every craft and occupation has its union or association; when people of similar aims or interests gather in clubs which are often a very potent social force, the power to speak gives standing and influence. In social gatherings—dinners, receptions, luncheons, banquets—popularity and prestige are usually proportioned to ability to speak with force and entertainingness.

Letters are now a part of Spoken English, and rare is the business man who does not dictate his letters.

On the whole, at least nine-tenths of the English used in the carrying on of the pursuits of modern life is spoken.

What are the high schools doing to meet the demand?

To ascertain the true answer to this question, the writer of this article sent out a questionnaire to all high schools in the United States of over 5,000 population, and to many of the five thousand class, as listed in the Directory of High Schools issued by the Bureau of Education at Washington. Eleven hundred copies were sent out.

The following is the form of the questionnaire, and shows the nature of the information sought:

QUESTIONNAIRE TO ENGLISH TEACHERS

This questionnaire is for the purpose of helping teachers of Spoken English. If you cannot answer all questions, answer some.

1. Do you have specific instruction in Spoken English or Oral Composition?_____
2. Is it a separate course_____or given in connection with literature_____or written composition_____or both?
3. Do the lessons in Spoken English come consecutively_____ or in connection with other English work on specified days_____ or is it merely incidental?_____
4. How much time to you give to Spoken English?
   a Freshman year: . . . No. of lessons_____ Minutes to a lesson_____
   b Sophomore year: . . . No. of lessons_____ Minutes to a lesson_____
   c Junior year: . . . . . No. of lessons_____ Minutes to a lesson_____
   d Senior year: . . . . . No. of lessons_____ Minutes to a lesson_____
5. What text-book, if any, do you use?_____
6. Do you teach parliamentary usage?_____ public speaking?_____ dramatics?_____ debating?_____
7. Is Spoken English required or elective?_____
8. What proportion of your pupils are reached?_____
9. Do you have a specially equipt teacher?_____ or do you handle it through the teachers of the regular English department?_____

10. Please list any books or magazine articles you thing valuable.
11. Any further contribution or comment_____

To this questionnaire, four hundred forty answers were received, distributed among all the states but two—Rhode Island and Nevada.

The results when tabulated were impressive.

That strong interest in Spoken English is present in all parts of the United States is unquestionable. Note the figures in the table below.

FIGURES OBTAINED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Number of questionnaires sent out	1100
Number returned	440
Number schools giving Spoken English as a separate course	122
Number schools giving specific instruction in Spoken English	389
Number schools not giving specific instruction in Spoken English	18
Giving Spoken English in connection with literature	47
Giving Spoken English in connection with written composition	67
Giving Spoken English in connection with both	225
Having Spoken English daily	63
On specified days in connection with other work	221
Merely incidental	101
Required	255
Elective	81
Number reaching all pupils	240
Number reaching 75 to 100 per cent	17
Number reaching 50 to 75 per cent	9
Number reaching 25 to 50 per cent	10
Number reaching 1 to 25 per cent	21
Number with specially equipped teachers	79
Number handling work through regular English teachers	258
Number having both	47
Number giving additional information	168
Number using text-book	124
Number using magazines	50
Teaching expression or dramatics	36
Teaching parliamentary usage	7
Teaching debating	24
Teaching public speaking	60

Of the 1100 questionnaires sent out, 440 were returned—exactly 40 per cent—an unusually large response, showing general interest.

But beyond this indication is another still more convincing—the fact that 168 busy English teachers took the trouble to give additional information. Nineteen wrote as much as a page or more.

Six sent outlines of their courses. And thirteen wrote separate letters. The tone of these special communications was of deep earnestness, sincerity in the desire to better the teaching of English, and enthusiasm for the work of Spoken English.

Only 18 schools made no attempt in the direction of Spoken English.

Three hundred eighty-nine claimed to give specific instruction in Spoken English. As 101, however, admit that the work was only incidental, they were manifestly not engaged in constructive, effective teaching of spoken language.

Two hundred eighty-eight schools, therefore, or more than 65 per cent, were making conscious efforts in the direction of training in mastering the language for speaking purposes.

The following table shows the proportion of time devoted exclusively to Spoken English in the four years of high school.

	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
Daily	2	3	13	11
2 per week	28	30	33	28
1 per week	190	187	162	157
2 per month	13	38	38	35
1 per month	10	12	11	10
4 or 5 per year	11	15	7	8
Miscellaneous	16	12	15	10

One thing stands out with unmistakable prominence—the large majority of the schools reporting on this point give one-fifth of the time of their English classes, 20 per cent of the time, to instruction in Spoken English, and set apart therefor a certain day in the week.

Approximately, then,

Eighty-one per cent of the schools give 20 per cent or more of the English time to Spoken English.

Eleven per cent give more than 20 per cent of their English time to Spoken English.

As to the number of students reached, 240 reported reaching all pupils, while 57 reported reaching a smaller percentage.

Thus it appears that most of the schools regard Spoken English as belonging essentially to the work of the English department, and are endeavoring to make it function for all classes and every individual. As this is true for so many schools, so widely distributed, it cannot be doubted that Spoken English has grown up

in response to a need and a demand, nor that the demand is rapidly growing stronger.

As 90 per cent of the schools are carrying on their Spoken English as an integral part of the English work, in the hands of the English teachers, it is manifest that the work in Spoken English, occurring thus in every state in the Union except two, is a democratic movement among the teachers themselves. It is a response to a widespread demand, and has arisen in an effort to make language training meet the needs of youth living in a new day.

It is also evident that instead of Spoken English being a requirement of the colleges put upon the high schools, it is a growth within the high schools which will surely react upon the colleges and universities with a demand for courses in Spoken English for those who must teach it, and desire the assistance of experts in addition to what their own ability and vision have enabled them to devise.

If the general practice in the more advanced and progressive schools is to give at least 20 per cent of their time to Spoken English, and if the requirements of business and professional life call for 90 per cent of Spoken English, manifestly there must be further adjustment of the teaching of English Language in the direction of the spoken if it is to function effectively.

THE PROPER EMPHASIS OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

INA PEREGO
Rockford High School, Illinois

TO attempt to decide which phase of speech training should be emphasized in the High School is about as confusing as to arrive in San Francisco for the first time by Ferry, where one is brought face to face with a continuous procession of cars four abreast, converging, unloading, reloading, parting and hurrying away again. You could take a Number Six out to the beautiful sunset district, Twin Peaks; or a Number Five to the Library, a storehouse of knowledge; or a Mission car to one of the many residence districts. However attractive Twin Peaks might be, a passenger

would feel incensed to be advised to take the Number Six, when his home could be reached only by the Mission car.

Analogous to this are the courses in the province of Speech, which carry one to the peaks of æsthetic pleasure, or to the realm of thought. Here too there is a Mission course in fundamentals which assists a number of travelers in limited circumstances through the ordinary streets of life. For anybody to maintain without qualification that this, that, or the other course is the best medium for the transmission of Speech Education is about as sensible as to insist that all residents of San Francisco should take the Number Six in preference to any other car.

Therefore, in order to find a legitimate point of departure for the discussion of this problem, I made a study of the history of Speech Education in the United States, a comparative study of five text books on Speech, and finally a study of the courses as they exist at present in High Schools, in so far as they have been reported.

I. THE HISTORY OF SPEECH TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES

E. H. Wilds, in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL for January, 1916, outlines the early history of speech training in the United States. According to his account, Declamation and Oratory were the first types of speech training to be offered. If tradition is permitted to be the deciding factor in the consideration of this problem, then we should declare that Declamation and Oratory should receive the emphasis at the present time. Accordingly, some schools, untouched by progress that has recently been made in the field of Speech, persist in offering these courses, supplemented with contests of the old type, to the exclusion of later and more useful forms of training.

In the first place, Declamation[1] is an artificial practice at best, which finds no parallel in real life. With the exception of the delivery of Lincoln's Gettysburg address and the Declaration of Independence on certain national occasions, we do not find speakers declaiming the world's great orations at community gatherings of any sort outside of schools. Professor O'Neill believes that Declamation, when confined to the classroom, may be a good exer-

[1] Usage has virtually made the word "declamation" to denote the memorized delivery of an oration written and spoken originally by some other person.

cise for the acquirement of a better delivery; but that it should be practiced as an end in itself to impress an audience, he disbelieves. It is not desirable then to devote any course exclusively to the practice of Declamation.

As for Oratory, if it is born in mind that this form of Public Address, characterized by symmetry of form, beauty of style and nobility of thought and feeling, is beyond the capacity of the average high school student who has scarcely mastered the rudimentary forms of passable conversation, we shall hesitate to include this in the High School curriculum. It is unfortunate that Oratory should have found its way into the High School in the company of other courses of collegiate difficulty, which were better omitted from the over-crowded curriculum.

One other undesirable state of affairs has persisted as a result of the early practices in the colleges. The exhibitory feature of Declamation and Oratory was given such prominence, it is no wonder that exhibition contests still survive in some localities. These are so deep-rooted in the unconscious mind of many teachers of Speech that to eliminate "show-off" as a test of the teacher's success is most difficult. Not that contests as such are bad, but that they tend to encourage artificial, melodramatic, or false types of delivery.

To generalize, the early history of Speech training has a negative valve in the solution of our problem: it shows us what not to emphasize.

II. A COMPARISON OF EMPHASIS IN FIVE SELECTED TEXT-BOOKS

	Shurter	Fulton and Trueblood	Chamberlain and Clark	Stratton	Woolbert and Weaver
Speech Composition	6%	10%	----	52%	27%
Vocal Technique	66%	55%	31%	6%	14%
Pronunciation and Enunciation	11%	8%	----	----	5%
Gesture	17%	27%	3%	----	6%
Reading	----	----	45%	----	10%
Debating	----	----	----	19%	5%
Dramatics	----	----	----	10%	10%
Rhetoric	----	----	----	----	7%
Conversation	----	----	----	----	2%
Theory and Criteria	----	----	20%	3%	10%

LIST OF THE FIVE TEXT-BOOKS ANALYZED

E. D. Shurter, *Public Speaking.*
Fulton and Trueblood, *Essentials of Public Speaking.*
Chamberlain and Clark, *Principles of Vocal Expression.*
Clarence Stratton, *Public Speaking.*
Woolbert and Weaver, *Better Speech.*

The percentages represent approximately the portion of the book devoted to each of the enumerated branches of speech training. The table shows that Shurter, and Fulton and Trueblood place the emphasis upon vocal technique. Chamberlain and Clark devote the larger part of their book to interpretative reading, with secondary stress on vocal technique. Stratton emphasizes speech composition. Woolbert and Weaver, in the most recent book of the five, distribute their attention rather fairly over ten phases of the subject, favoring speech composition to a slight extent. It is important to observe that Stratton, and Woolbert and Weaver have striven to meet the needs of the average pupil in his everyday use of speech. The remaining three books are more suited to advanced students who are training for public appearance as artists.

Our comparison of five text-books and our acquaintance with numerous others reveal no uniformity of emphasis among teachers and authorities in the field. However, there is not sufficient evidence to discover whether this lack of uniformity is due to disagreement on the part of authorities or merely to the exercise of personal preference in the selection of material for their books.

III. THE PRESENT SITUATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Many and varied are the courses now offered in the high schools. Mr. Houghton reports[2] that he emphasizes practice and minimizes theory. Principles are developed through outside assignments, written reports, and an occasional quiz. To one per cent of study, he gives 99 per cent of practice in reading, declamation, and extempore speaking, with little study of speech structure in his beginning course.

Miss Elva Forncrook[3] believes that over fifty per cent of the time should be given to voice training.

[2] Q. J. S. E., IV, p. 154.
[3] Q. J. S. E., IV, p. 273.

Mr. Charles Dawson[4] states that the "fundamental emphasis should be on breathing, formation of sound or phonetics, and control of pitch and inflection—because such training is applicable to any workmanlike speech whatever."

The most recent and most complete report of courses offered in high schools is made by Miss Franc Berry.[5] A number of desirable courses are outlined, covering the entire field of speech. To discover what is emphasized in any one of them was fruitless. In actual practice there is probably no uniformity. Some teachers stress speech composition, others dramatics, others debating, and still others story-telling. All agree, however, in offering some training in vocal technique.

IV. FACTORS THAT HELP IN DETERMINING PROPER EMPHASIS

Before a teacher can ascertain what phase of Speech training is most needed by the pupils, there are certain factors with which he should acquaint himself. His most immediate concern would be the predominating nationality of the pupils. Personal experience with Italian children in New York City has led me to the conclusion that as a race they excel in dramatics. This feature may be indulged in sufficiently to attract and hold their interest; but it would be wise to supplement their native endowment with training in the more severe form of speech composition. On the other hand, a group largely composed of Swedish boys and girls needs to cultivate the freedom, spontaneity, and mobility of expression that may be secured in the dramatic class. I have found the Swedish to be rather stolid, uncreative people, as a rule, who work diligently on intellectual problems but whose emotions are undeveloped. Jewish and Irish young people are naturally fluent and emotionally expressive. The emphasis in their case must be determined by other factors.

A second consideration is the class of society to which the children belong. If they live in factory districts and are likely to seek their living in factories, free participation in dramatics should be provided in the school. Work in factories is on the whole uncreative, automatic, and deadening to the mind. Since the young worker finds little motor, mental, or emotional outlet in this type of labor, he should be trained to satisfy his needs during his leisure

[4] Q. J. S. E., II, p. 3.
[5] Q. J. S. E., VIII, p 77.

hours by participation in plays and games. Work in a factory neither demands nor gives much opportunity for communication by speech. It is said that where the whir of machinery makes speech impossible, the workers become proficient in gesture or pantomimic communication. Training in the social aspects of speech would then be of most worth.

Young people engaged in agricultural pursuits need special training in conversation. Little attention need be paid to developing gesture or refined bodily response. These young people are so active on the farm that they prefer to engage in undemonstrative speech confined largely to the organs of articulation. I found it difficult to secure visible, bodily response to thought and feeling when training a group of farm boys to present plays to rural communities. They were not inferior mentally (for they were winners in stock-judging contests) but they were physically lethargic through loss of vitality in performing chores before coming to school. Mr. Arvold of North Dakota claims to have found good actors among farmers. This is no doubt possible among certain nationalities. However I am not sure that farmers need practice in dramatics, so much as they need to see plays well acted by young people who are less burdened with heavy labor and whose speech and vocalization is of superior quality.

If the high school is located in a commercial city or town where many of the graduates are likely to enter business, a course in salesmanship would be valuable to some; a thorough course in fundamentals would be necessary to all.

These scattered instances suggest ways of relating speech training to the vocational interests of the pupils.

Climate is another determining factor in seeking proper emphasis. A majority of the boys and girls of California are physically active and so healthy that to keep their lively spirits in check is a nice problem of discipline. They excel in dramatics and, I dare say, in other speech activities. Perhaps they would profit more widely if the emphasis were placed on speech composition and argumentation, which call for concentrated effort and orderly thinking.

I have no statistics on the subject, but I believe that if a Speech survey were made of a group of boys and girls in California, they would show less need of speech correction than those

living in a less favorable climate. Perversions, suppressions, and neuroses attendant upon them, which are at the root of some speech disorders, are less prevalent among people who live out-of-doors amid beautiful surroundings than they are among people living in a changeable climate and occupied within doors most of the time.

Not only the climate, but also local traditions will unconsciously if not consciously influence the teacher's choice of courses in speech. Teachers in Southern schools find a decided interest in story-telling and dramatics. It is advisable not to over-stress these subjects, but to give considerable attention to diction. Great tact is needed to teach diction successfully, especially in the South, for Southerners of good family take great pride in their dialect and are seldom willing to substitute standardized English.

In some localities populated by foreigners of varying nationalities, the teacher can attempt little more than the eradication of foreign accent.

Teachers of wider experience than my own can offer more convincing illustrations of the influence which nationality, social status, climate, and sectional peculiarities bear upon the problem of suitable speech training. I do not hope to gain the acceptance of my individual conclusions without the presentation of further evidence which is outside the scope of this paper. I do affirm that the proper emphasis of speech training should be decided not by looking within the field of Speech exclusively, but by taking the above factors into consideration as well.

After a teacher has decided to the best of her ability what should be taught, she has the problem of reconciling what the pupils most need with her capacity to give. Few teachers in the profession are equally well-trained in all branches of speech education. Every one of us has a special aptitude for one course and less interest in others. And yet, under the present regime, most high schools are fortunate to have one full-time teacher of Speech, who is expected to cover the entire field if desired.

What can we do about it? Some teachers are conscientiously preparing themselves to teach any and all branches of Speech. Most of them are capable in two or three at most. If this is true I think it is better for the teacher to offer the courses that she is best fitted to give. If her choice does not coincide with the greatest need of her pupils, I should advise her to seek a position where her specialty is most needed.

V. OPINIONS OF AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD

Thus far there has been but slight mention of speech disorders, the correction of which calls for special treatment and emotional re-education. Very few high schools offer such training; in fact such correction is more likely to be achieved in special classes in the grades while the children are still young. As the elementary schools are not doing the work in more than a dozen localities, the conditions in the high schools are worse than they might be.

In a speech survey of the women students of Mt. Holyoke College,[6] it was found that seventeen per cent of the entire student body were defective in speech. When we bear in mind that this is a highly selected group of women of superior mental endowment, how much more likely it is that high school boys and girls, an unselected group, should reveal a similar need of training in corrective speech. The survey of school children in Madison, Wisconsin, showed that from five to seven per cent were defective in speech.

Dr. Smiley Blanton believes that "oratory and public speaking, both of which have the highest educational value, do not attempt to meet the needs of any but a restricted class. These leave untouched, for the most part, the great body of citizens for whom the institutions of democracy demand the correct use of language." Professor O'Neill agrees with Dr. Blanton that we are preparing a few unusually gifted students for show purposes, at the expense of the many who need it most. And yet, the survey of high school courses to which I have previously referred does not report training in corrective speech.

Therefore, because the need is great, every high school in the United States should attempt to provide some training in corrective speech, whatever may be the chosen emphasis among other courses. If this work must be done by one teacher, the variety of courses for normal students will be of necessity still more limited.

Wherever the emphasis is placed, I should like to conclude with the proposition that training in the language of gesture should precede training in vocalization. The logical place for such training is in the grades. Since few of the grade schools offer adequate exercises in pantomime, the high school will do well to begin with

[6] Q. J. S. E., IX, No. 1.

this type of expression. This view is more acceptably and vividly described by G. S. Hall[7]:

> The habitual use of speech as the medium of all kinds of communication has tended to make us forget the language of gesture, the cultivation of which has been neglected, not merely in preparation for the stage, but in the field of general education. Speech tends in this country more than anywhere else, to become monotonous and inexpressive of its emotional accompaniment. The cultivation of the latter would not only greatly enrich social intercourse, but would make directly for honesty. It is far harder to say "No" with every kind of intense negative expression of gesture, face, and vocal emphasis, than merely to pronounce the word "no" in a dull, unemphatic way.
>
> Truth and reality can best be both felt by the speaker and conveyed to others by talking not with the tiny muscles involved in articulation, but with nearly all the possibilities of voluntary motion. Without gesture in the larger sense we should know little or nothing of the feelings.

Mr. George Santayana[8] pursues this theme in an equally interesting fashion:

> We must not point; we must not pout; we must not cry; we must not laugh aloud; we must not only avoid attracting attention, but our attention must not be obviously attracted; it is silly to gaze, says the nursery governess, and rude to stare. Presently words, too, will be reduced to a telegraphic code.
>
> Conversation in the quiet home will dispense even with these phrases. Nothing will be required but a few pragmatic grunts and signals for action. Where the spirit of comedy has departed, company becomes constrained, reserve eats up spirit, and people fall into a penurious melancholy in their scruple to be always exact, sane, and reasonable, never to mourn, never to glow, never to betray a passion or weakness, or venture to utter a thought they might not wish to harbour forever. Yet the irony of fate pursues these enemies of comedy, and for fear of wearing a mask for a moment, they are hypocrites all their lives. Their very reserve becomes a pose, a convention, and their mincing speech turns to cant. Sometimes this evasion of impulsive sentiment fosters a poignant sentimentality beneath. The comedy goes on silently behind the scenes, until perhaps it gets the upper hand and becomes positive madness; or else it breaks out in some shy indirect fashion, as among Americans with their perpetual joking. Where there is no habitual art and no moral liberty, the instinct for direct expression is atrophied for want of exercise; then slang, humorous perversity of phrase or manner act as safety-valve to sanity; and you manage to express yourself in spite of the censor by saying something grotesquely different from what you mean. That is a long way round to sincerity and an ugly one.

[7] *Pedagogical Seminary*, XXVIII, p. 171.

[8] *Dial*, LXX, p. 629.

Both of the articles quoted from should be read in their entirety to be appreciated. Until some future psychologist is able to prove scientifically that the views of Hall and Santayana are not sound, I shall continue to believe that unless we insist that training in gesture language and emotional expression go hand in hand with training in speech, coming generations will be led more and more to use speech as a means of concealing rather than of expressing their thoughts.

THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF HIGH SCHOOL DRAMATICS

CLARENCE D. THORPE
University of Oregon

DRAMA is the meeting place of life and art. A play is literature, but it is something more than literature and something different. A play is no play at all until it is spoken and acted. And when it is spoken and acted, it ceases to be merely a play and becomes life. Dramatics is the objectification of the students' reactions to literature; it is a portrayal in concrete form of the spirit and meaning of a play. Through dramatic interpretation the warmth of life is breathed into the inanimate figures of the printed page, and they become flesh and blood realties that walk and talk before us. Into a play the young actor joyously throws all that he knows of life and the world; from it he takes new conceptions of the human heart, keener, fresher insight into all existence, and disciplined powers that will always be an asset to him.

John Keats once declared, "I am never certain of any truth until I have felt it on my pulses," meaning, "I never really know anything until I have experienced it." Through dramatics students really come to know the things they read about. Patriotism ceases to be merely a name to the lad who has represented Nathan Hale bravely facing his British inquisitors, ready to die for his country; Mark Anthony is no longer a misty figure in a long hard book to the lad who has stood in the Forum delivering the funeral oration to an excited mob. The book symbols have now become vitalized; the boy has felt them in his pulses:

literature means something to him now because he has brought to its study his own life experience—he has lived it.

In commenting one time upon his own mental growth, Plutarch, whose *Lives* every one should read, said something that all who really come to know literature must sooner or later find true for themselves. "I understand not matters so much by words" he declared "as I came to understand words by common experience and knowledge I had of things." Too often we try to make pupils read plays or poems as if they were merely things of words; but words are mere symbols of ideas, and must remain mere signs until we learn to make these words say something to us in terms of our own lives. Once we bring to the fore illustrations from our own past experience to vivify and make real the words we are reading, a great light breaks, and we indeed come to understand. Good actors not only bring to their study of a play all that they have gleaned from full living in the past, but they actually go out after new experiences to help them interpret their roles intelligently. Frances Starr tells how in working up the part of Becky in *The Case of Becky*, she studied the delinquent girl at first hand. "There is nothing, absolutely nothing, that I do in Becky that I have not studied and observed in the conduct and deportment of some incorrigible girl in the House of Correction." When Miss Starr was playing the part of Marie in *Marie-Odile*, she went to a convent to live that she might learn the habits and thoughts of a nun. High school students who work in plays must thus go out in life and find the prototypes of those who figure in the piece they are studying. It is this sort of thing that makes genuine study of literature different from the sleepy conning of words into which it so often descends.

"The best part of a work," declares the dramatist Benavente, "is not what is written in it, but what escapes from it." Through the fine distillation process of dramatic interpretation, the essence of a piece of literature escapes, to become a pure and life-giving draught to those who drink deeply of it. "You must get into the habit," says Ruskin to students of literature, "of looking intensely at words and assuring yourself of their meaning syllable by syllable." A real study of books demands just this close scrutiny of words. But how much of it can you get students to do in the ordinary run of study? Practically none. In play work, however, the student does take time to get exact meanings. He learns, often

for the first time, to look intensely at words for their full significance. He discovers the necessity of putting himself into the place of the characters in the play and of thinking and feeling as they would think and feel. He sees that there is a real connection between literature and life, and begins to look about him to find the Shylocks, the Kates, the Aunt Marys and Ernests, the Merely Mary Anns, the Hiram Boltons, and the Peters in his own home town.

Earnest, sincere dramatic work then becomes the best possible way to know literature; moreover, it is in many ways better for an understanding of life than the study of life itself. The many great plays that have come to us from the world's literary artists, geniuses who have looked beneath the surface of things into the hearts of men, contain mines of condensed life truth and experience ready to our hand. For a study of mankind you can go to no better source than the drama of all time. A genius like Shakespeare has an insight that surpasses that of the most widely-experienced and best educated of ordinary men. His quick eye observes everything; his keen intellect, looking with almost supernatural power beneath the mere seeming of things to the real and eternal, interprets all that he sees; and his marvelous pen, gleaning its rich harvest from his teeming brain, sets down all in enduring words of truth and light.

To understand all this richness to be found in good plays, a student must live the life represented; he can do this best in the spoken drama. Dramatic work is a re-creation of that which the author originally saw and portrayed. Great actors have been people who have lived largely, as did Sarah Bernhardt, of whom it is said, "Her outlook on life was broad and catholic. All life to her had an enthusiastic interest." The actor must be able to feel deeply the role he is playing; he must be able to live it deeply and vividly as he reproduces it at each rehearsal. Marjorie Rambeau, a growing favorite among the younger actresses, tells us that when she gets a part, she says to herself, "Now, you, Marjorie Rambeau, are going to become this person." And then she earnestly sets about to become that person, aiming to present the character sincerely and without trickery, for she abhors trickery of any kind, she declares. Her goal in her work is truth, for, she says, "there is no thrill like the thrill of truth."

The finest ideal for dramatic interpretation I have ever seen expressed was beautifully set forth in a talk by Director Stanislavsky to his players at the beginning of their work on *The Bluebird.* A printed copy of this speech should be on the desk of every director of school dramatics.

"The production of The Blue Bird," he said in part, "must be made with the purity and fantasy of a ten-year-old child. It must be naïve, simple, light, full of the joy of life, cheering and imaginative like the sleep of a child; as beautiful as a child's dream and at the same time as majestic as the ideal of a poetic genius and thinker. Let the Blue Bird in the theatre thrill the grandchildren and arouse serious thoughts and deep feelings in their grandparents. Let the grandchildren on coming home from the theatre feel the joy of existence. . . . At the same time let their grandfathers and grandmothers once more become inspired with the natural desire of man: to enjoy God's world and be glad it is beautiful.

". . . In order to make the public listen to the fine shades of your feelings, you have to live them through yourself intensely. To live through definite intelligible feelings is easier than to live through the subtle soul vibrations of a poetic nature. To reach those experiences it is necessary to dig deep into the material which is handed to you for creation. To the study of the play we shall devote jointly a great deal of work and attention and love. But that is little. In addition, you have to prepare yourselves independently. I speak of your personal life obesrvation, which will broaden your imagination and sensitiveness. Make friends of children. Enter into their world. Watch nature more, and her manifestations surrounding us. Make friends of dogs and cats, and look oftener into their eyes to see their souls. Thereby you will be doing the same as Maeterlinck did before he wrote the play, and you will come closer to the author. More than anything else, we must avoid theatricalness in the external presentation of the Blue Bird, as well as in the spiritual interpretation, for it might change the fairy dream of the poet into an ordinary extravaganza."

The drama, thus conceived, is indeed the meeting place of art and life. Every high school student who essays a role in a drama should have steadily held before him these lofty ideals of Stanislavsky's. He should be taught that the one way to satisfactory

interpretation is through sincere, intelligent effort, and that there is no true success to be gained in playwork that is not simply and naturally connected up with the life around him.

Few college students nowadays, and almost no high school students, care anything at all for Shakespeare. Most of them have an actual distaste for him and all his works. As with Shakespeare, so with most of the other great ones. Why? I wonder if it is not largely due to the way they have studied him, or have had him thrust upon them—as if he were a dull book poet who had written many intricate passages to be analyzed and many hard sayings to be understood. If they had met Shakespeare on his own ground, as a dramatist, through the avenue of spoken drama, would they not have loved him? I believe they would.

They would like him, first, as I have shown, because they would understand him; second, because students never dislike anything they do voluntarily for the sheer love of it, and for this reason will never dislike literature studied by the spoken drama method. Their dramatic work is motivated. They have something tangible to get hold of, something definite to accomplish; so they do not need to be goaded on to their tasks. The mere pleasure of acting, the satisfaction of mental revelation, the ever-recurrent surprise at the discovery of unsuspected hidden meanings in a play, the glory of interpreting all this to fathers, mothers, and friends, are adequate compensation for the severest toil. I have often been surprised to see students who seemed entirely apathetic in their school work spring to life in play rehearsal and go at the tedious, exacting task of preparing for the stage with the most laudable animation. I have seen listless classes in literature become ardent groups of young enthusiasts by merely being formed into play reading sections. Certainly one of the problems of modern education is to lead students to like their studies. If through dramatics we can bring high school youngsters to do much of their literature work gladly; if we can in this manner help them to develop an abiding affection for Shakespeare and the rest, certainly there need be no additional argument for dramatics.

There are many other wholly commendable results that follow the study of spoken drama. Interest in matters of history and an acquaintance with the manners and customs of past ages can best be stimulated through plays and pageantry. To how many of us

has the Elizabethan age first been made real through the stage! The dress and the manners even of thirty years ago burst upon us almost as a revelation when we set to restore them on the stage. The splendid results of the many recent historical pageants, including the great tercentenary celebrations, fresh in the minds of most of us, are convincing proof that this method of re-creating the past is the best possible way to study history.

The drill in speech work is of such value that there are many who hold that dramatics is the best single means of teaching students to speak well. I am one who believes this. I believe it because in dramatic work, though we may never do it elsewhere, we take the time and pains really to teach pupils to speak pure, distinct English—to soften down their harsh tones, to enunciate clearly, to pronounce with fine attention to correctness, to shade meanings by right emphasis and inflection. As a nation we use the most careless English. The rough and ready spirit upon which we pride ourselves seems to do admirably for business and the sports, but it is not conducive to cultivated speech. Lately we are getting a bit shamefaced about it, and would "mend our speech a little." But we have a long way to go. We are awkward and self conscious, like a boy in his first long trousers. Even our teachers are often like babes lost in the woods, stumbling along in the shadows of careless English habits. Dramatics in our schools will help wonderfully. On the stage one must articulate distinctly, must project his voice over to the audience, must employ pleasantly-modulated tones—else public failure. The best of it is, that frequently, after the discipline of the stage, the old slovenly habits disappear, and the new manner becomes habitual, and, what is a greater triumph, a taste will have been created for better speech. By the constant repetition of lines containing beautiful, expressive language, one comes to develop a feeling for such language. Even in character roles the language is forceful and expressive, if not always according to Hoyle in construction. In other parts, the music of the language singing itself over and over, as the student goes through rehearsals, sinks deep into his consciousness, and his ear becomes attuned to detect defective and inharmonious speech much as a trained musician shrinks at discordant notes. The reaction upon his own language is inevitable; he learns to be dissatisfied with weak, inadequate expression, and to demand of himself speech of power and beauty.

Byproducts of dramatics are many. In all our school work, I suppose there is nothing that quite equals play production as a disciplinary training. So much of what we do these days is slipshod—a little of everything and nothing well done. But success in dramatic work requires vigorous, sustained effort; it demands concentration; it involves training of the memory and drill in mental and physical coördinations. In dramatics only excellence will do. Lines must be learned thoroughly; the acting must be done right; entrances must be on time; speeches must not come tardy off. In the hands of a good coach, for once, if never before in his life, a youngster in a play will do a given piece of work well. It means much to a boy or girl to learn really to stick to a hard thing until it is done. Someday—soon, I trust—we are going to rediscover the value of disciplinary training in our schools; and in that day, dramatics will, I predict, hold a proud place among the subjects best fitted to bring out the latent powers of our youth.

There are other byproducts. The socializing influence is not the least. In a play a student learns team work. One actor alone is nothing, and yet he is everything. He is a part of a machine, every part of which must work in harmony with every other part. An understanding of the obligations arising in connection with group action, and a development of the coöperative spirit result. Again, in staging a play, there are always numberless details to be cared for; there is the business end of it—the house to be secured, the scenery to be provided for, often painted, the arrangements to be made with the publishers; some one will learn much of royalties and acting rights. There is, finally, the necessity of learning to do outside things while carrying on the regular school work, and so is demonstrated one of the great practical lessons of life—the need for establishing right relationships between one's vocation and his avocations.

These are the more or less direct results of dramatic work, especially upon the student himself. There is still another educational function of high school dramatics of such importance that I want to consider it briefly in a section by itself. That is the part that the school spoken drama has to play in developing a better stage in America, and its consequent effect upon our social, cultural, and moral life as a people.

In spite of the words of good cheer of Forbes-Robertson and

other optimistic souls like him to the effect that the American stage is getting better, I believe the average friend to good drama and wholesome entertainment who follows the course of things on our stage today is usually in a state of gloom and depression. There are some good plays put on; after a Broadway season including a good half dozen of Shakespeare's masterpieces, played by the most talented of our actors, backed by offerings from Guitry, Tchekoff, Wilde, Pirandello, Ibsen, and Andreyev, topped off by the artistic performances of the Russians, one must admit that. But the trouble is that beside the great mass of things put on these are but a handful. And worse: for the most part only one little section, New York, sees these better plays, but the whole nation sees the trash. For the country at large the proportion of good plays to bad is pitifully small. As Arthur Hornblow puts it, "The worth-while play, the brilliantly written drawing-room comedy, the charming play of sentiment, is literally snowed under by an avalanche of silly, vacuous, salacious, bed-room farces. For one clean play that wins favor, at least three suggestive pieces score a hit and settle down for a long run."

Who is to blame? The public of course. In the long run, the public gets what it is willing to pay for. Says one caustic observer: "Our stage is as it is today because the men who control it—with few exceptions—are persons without culture or taste—men incapable of even comprehending idealism and the higher aspirations of humanity—mere commercial traders who happen to dispense nasty plays instead of vegetables, and who have but one fixed object in life—to make money. Naturally, they supply the public with what best lines their pockets." The public will always have what it demands.

In reflecting on this subject, we cannot help considering the moral and social aspects of the situation. America is coming to a day when, as never before, she must take thought as to preparation for her leisure. We are rapidly passing from the stage where our chief concern is with making a living to one where we must take heed as to how to make a life. As a people we have vastly more leisure than we had a generation ago. It is in our spare time that we make our characters; hence it is of grave importance that we have the desire and opportunity to spend that leisure profitably. It may seem to be going far to suggest that it is quite possible that nations like the Roman Empire and Spain owed much of their

decadence to the degrading amusements to which they turned for recreation. There seems fair force to the logic, however, that would find close connection between the brutal enjoyments of the arena, the sottish indulgences of the sensual, luxury-loving Latins, and the fall of Rome; that would trace the swift decline of Spain to the sordid pleasure of the bull pen. Anything that debases the character of individuals must lead down the straight, sure road to national degradation.

In the light of this truth, is it not time for thoughtful people in America to be alarmed? Where are we turning today for our amusements? I have already indicated the condition as to the theatre, but that is only a beginning. Turn wherever you will, and the situation is no better. It is fair to declare three-fourths of the plays of the legitimate theatre bad; it is safe to assert that fully nine-tenths of the movies are not fit to see. And the movies are everywhere; great gaudy picture-palaces, little narrow, box-like sheds—on every street and corner of our New Yorks and San Franciscos, in the rural hamlet of Crescent, in the remote lumber camp of Marcola—thousands of them, daily, hourly grinding out their grist of silly, infantile scenarios, ever telling over and over their tales of lust and crime, ever crowding the minds of our youngsters with false, foolish notions of life, ever holding before them maudlin, sickly ideals of love and marriage and all the rest of the great human relationships.

And our music! And our dancing! The music that young America is hearing today is that of the dance hall—the softening, seductive moan of the saxaphone mingled with the shrill blatancy of the trombone, set to the African rhythm of jazz. A little while ago, I sat in the balcony watching the big Junior Prom at one of our state universities. In the dimly-lighted hall filled with a sea of tightly gripped couples, the orchestra blared out its usual barbaric strains, and the dancers walked, wheeled, and twisted their way in and out of the throng, down one end of the hall, up the other. Their faces were set and tense, like one who runs a race where much is at stake. At intervals in the bang of jazz, couples seriously walked to the punch bowls and seriously sipped the amber drink, then seriously locked themselves in a new embrace and struggled off again into the crowd. There were no evidences of gayety there, hardly any smiles, only fixed, patient, sometimes rapt, sometimes

bored faces, and that endless shuffle of many, many feet keeping time to the beating, monotonous jungle music.

"And this," I said to myself, "is young America enjoying itself."

We are not engaging in wholesome amusement. If one will face the facts squarely, he must admit that the widespread patronage of the cheap movie houses and the universal vogue of African music and dancing that corresponds to it, along with the enormous support of musical-burlesque and salacious entertainment in the play-houses, to say nothing of the tremendous circulation of third-rate reading matter, simply mean that Americans are indulging in pleasures that are low. "We are developing a ragtime religion," declares Owen Wister. There is a rapid drift toward sex obsession. The preoccupation of our commercial drama, our movies, much of our newer reading matter—I cannot call it literature—with sex, is all bearing a heavy fruitage in the lives of our young people. Budding, so-called intelligentsia, like Mr. Dreiser, virtuously encourage this, but wise men will not. To my mind preoccupation with sex is fatal. I would sooner trust gladiatorial combats and bull fights, if I were to build a strong, useful nation. Who can count the evils growing out of our present state of amusements? Dissipated energy, crime, discontent, unrest, broken homes, are some of the sure byproducts of this perversion of a legitimate desire for amusement.

What is the remedy? "Educate the people," says Arthur Hornblow. Educate the people to a different type of amusement, we must, indeed. That undoubtedly is one of the keys to a better national drama and to more wholesome recreation all around. And that is where high school dramatics come in. "I do not make my plays for the public" says Benavente, "I make the public for my plays. . . . What I mean is," he continues, "that by constantly giving the public good plays, public taste will be formed." Now that so large a part of our population is becoming educated, rightly conducted dramatics in our high schools can do marvelous things toward creating a taste for better plays. The Little Theatre, the Repertory Theatre, The Drama League, state-wide movements for good drama—all can do much, but all together can not match the influence of the high school stage, once that stage comes into its own. As a rule high schools present only plays of literary value. The result is that not only the students taking part in the perfor-

mance, but their families, their friends, and the community as a whole learn to appreciate a higher type of drama. Consider the vast numbers in our high schools; consider, too, that the school generation changes every four years; then consider the large total of high schools in our country—I suppose there are not less than 10,000—and think of each one of these, a quiet, constant educative force for better drama, a point of brightness radiating steady rays of light in all directions, then we get some idea of the tremendous potential influence of high school dramatics. Why, in my own state of Oregon, there are about 200 high schools. Let each one of these produce for the public only two good plays each year, to say nothing of the scores of others, not so produced, that would be studied as spoken drama within the schools, and we have the startling total of something like 400 plays. That, I am safe in saying, would be more clean, worth-while drama than has been seen on the commercial stage in the whole state for ten years. After all, it is through the high school that national taste is largely molded, and it would seem that if our audiences as a whole are ever to develop more than a musical burlesque dramatic appetite, the high schools, through sincere and purposeful effort in producing drama of excellence, must lead the way.

It is a lofty and worthy task. Many of our schools are doing splendid service in breaking the ground. Their students are every year putting on some fine things from the great dramatists. Our boys and girls are learning a few of the secrets of fine plays and the noble art of acting them, and the public is learning to like good plays too. In all this, there is high hope for a day when the theatre audience in America will demand drama of artistry and beauty instead of the insipid and evil rubbish they ask for today—and, demanding it, they will get it. A taste for better drama should lead people to care for a different, higher type of amusement all around; there should be built stronger, cleaner character, and our people should live healthier, saner, happier lives.

Only by educated leadership can conditions be changed. The rapid growth of the Little Theatre Movement, the establishment of many new repertory theatres in cities over the country, the rapid awakening to the fact that in the face of new production costs and the fierce competition of the movie, the spoken drama can be saved to the smaller places only through local activity and organization—all this is creating a demand for those who have the ideals and

training to help carry on the work. The high schools must do their share to help supply this need, as well as to help create the taste that will make success possible. Their possibilities for influence are almost limitless. Certainly the fight cannot be won without them.

To put what I have tried to say very briefly: As a method of studying literature the function of dramatics is to help us understand and interpret life and learn the manners and customs of people past and present. As a discipline it is a preparation for successful living, a drill in good habits of speech, a training in mental and physical coördination. As a cultural activity and a social and moral influence it is a preparation for well-spent leisure, a force working toward the elevation of standards of taste in the drama, toward a demand for cleaner, more wholesome amusement, toward healthier individual character, toward a higher, more stable national life.

DEBATE COACHING IN HIGH SCHOOL — BENEFITS AND METHODS

RUTH E. HUSTON
Northwestern High School, Detroit, Michigan

ONE morning several years ago a debating coach and his team of three high school boys were returning from the scene of battle. The night before they had been defeated by debaters who were the product of a much smaller and more insignificant high school than their own. The defeat rankled. They were unable to explain it. Then the coach stated that the occasion only proved what he had always known,—that debating was just a game based on the suppression rather than the finding of truth, that it trained students in chicanery, and that there was nothing fair about the whole business.

A touch of this reaction may have been experienced by most coaches the morning after a particularly bitter defeat, but fortunately the average coach is too wise to pass on this kind of thing to his students. Without doubt this one example is an extreme case. On the other hand there are principals and teachers who now and then offer conscientious objections to debating in High Schools.

Debating is accused of taking too much of a teacher's time when there are so many weak students in the school who need his attention. Debating trains too few people. It sacrifices ethics to winning. It is the work of the coach and not of the student. Debating is too strenuous for High School people. It is perfectly absurd for immature boys and girls to think that they are solving the problems of the world. There may be other objections, but these are the criticisms which are most frequently voiced in the secondary school field.

To the first objection there are several answers. The High School debating coach spends no more time in his special field than does the athletic coach. Those who applaud the latter for leaving his regular class work at 2:30 or 3:30 o'clock in the afternoon to work until 6 P. M. with his team, can hardly condemn the debating coach for doing the same. It is absurd to argue that time saved from debating would be spent on weak students. None of the teachers who do not coach debating spend every afternoon and evening besides vacations working with delinquent students, because there is not a strong enough incentive in such work. It is to the glory of our subject that it is fascinating enough to hold one's interest even through the energy sapping period of a spring vacation. Furthermore, the time spent is justified a thousandfold by the results obtained, as will be made clear later in this article.

Those who say that High School debating trains too few people are ignoring the facts of the case. For example, consider our own school. Last year we had forty-eight people who participated in our schedule of inter-house debates, contests conducted between the eight grade-rooms for the school championship. Then there were twenty students who received consistent training in our debating class which met five days each week and which is accorded full academic credit. We also had six students on our first team for inter-school debating, and six people on the second team. This makes a total of eighty students who received consistent training and practice in the art of Protagoras. This omits the thirty-five who received training in our debating club, which was enthusiastic enough to convince any skeptic that debating fills a real need in the lives of developing boys and girls. Eighty is not such an impressive number when you compare it with 3300 which is the enrollment of our High School, but it more than justifies itself when

we compare it with the number who participate in other curricular activities. Even omitting debating class, we coached sixty students in our inter-house and inter-school contests last year. This number compares more than favorably with the number participating in dramatics, football, basketball, track, or the school paper. There is no school activity which attempts to afford participation to all of the student body. Debating does its share.

The ethics of debate are sacrificed to winning only when the coach is unscrupulous, or when the principal or superintendent make a coach feel that he must get decisions at any price. Both of these circumstances are the exception rather than the rule. In five years of debate coaching I have come in direct contact with between thirty-five and forty High School coaches in Michigan. With one exception, I have never found them dishonest or tricky in management or in coaching. Thirty-five to one surely ought to vindicate the honor of any profession. I have never known a High School principal or superintendent who demanded victory at any price; neither have I ever heard of one from any other coach. If this practice is at all prevalent, it must flourish on college rather than secondary school soil.

On those rare occasions when a debate is more the work of the coach than of the student, one must remember that again this is the exception rather than the rule. One of the ear-marks is perfectly "canned" rebuttal. At one debate which I heard last winter, the first rebuttal speaker talked most fluently for five minutes on what his opponents had never said; and he did not use a single note; he completely ignored all that his opponents had said. In a case like that one cannot help feeling that a coach may have written the rebuttal and coached the student to deliver it as a set speech. However, even "canned" rebuttal does not prove that the coach did the work. He may have made the student do it, which is bad strategy rather than bad morals. In either case "canned" rebuttal is its own punishment; it detracts more than it adds to the case. Coaches are prevented from giving debaters much assistance by professional honor, by the fact that rebuttal will reveal the student's real power, and by the student's own sense of honor. I have found that the average High School debater has a very keen sense of right and wrong, and that he expects his instructors to live up to this standard. When they fail to do so, the remedy is the

discharge of the dishonest coach,—as elsewhere we seek to cull out the unfit and the dishonest,—not the abolition of debating.

Is inter-school debating too strenuous for our boys and girls? Ask them. They glory in it! Debating is not too strenuous for their scholarship. In the past five years I have had the pleasure of coaching thirty-two inter-school debaters. Of this number twenty-five were decidedly honor students with a predominantly A record, four were primarily of B grade, while only three received C for the major part of their work. Never have I had a debater who had to be dropped from the team because of poor scholarship, which is proof that debating does not interfere with scholarship. Neither is debating too strenuous for their physical welfare. At Northwestern our entire debating squad constituted the most enthusiastic tennis "fans" in school. All last spring, even before debating season ended, our debating teams were fighting on the tennis court just as vigorously as they had fought over rebuttal on the platform. Not one of my thirty-two debaters ever suffered a physical breakdown in high school, and not one was ever absent from a contest because of illness. Through five years of coaching which has involved forty-four debates, only one debater was ever absent from a contest; that girl was kept away by the death of her father. No other group engaged in extra-curricular activities can boast of a better record in scholarship or health. Obviously debating is not too strenuous.

The last objection is also contrary to fact. High School students do *not* think that they are solving the world's problems when they engage in debate. If any is presumptuous enough to think such a thing, the thought lasts only until he is involved in the mass of evidence on both sides. Then the debater soon realizes that the question is exceedingly difficult to solve, that perhaps it can never be solved justly, and that the best he can do is to *think* about it. Debating is the best method in the world by which to convince developing minds that every great problem has dozens and dozens of contributing factors which can not be disposed of by a simple yes or no. Last year after debating the independence of the Philippines for six months, one of my debaters said, "I thought that all the United States had to do was to let the Philippines go, whenever she felt like it. Now I realize that there are many things to be considered. I am not exactly sure where I stand."

Are there still other objections to inter-school debating for High Schools? If there are, bring them forward, pile them as high as you will. No matter how great your collection of faults, it will be offset a thousandfold by the virtues of the game. The benefits of secondary school forensics are so real, so vital, so convincing that they must always challenge admiration and respect in the face of any opposition.

One of the greatest benefits derived from debating is the correlation, organization, and use of knowledge already obtained in various courses of study. Too often the charge is made that a student gets his history in one course, his French in another, his English in another, with little or no relationship between them. Debating furnishes the best of bridges for such chasms. Last year when we were debating the question of cancellation of war debts, one of my debaters exclaimed, "Why coach, it seems to me that we use *everything* that we ever learned in school in this debate." The same opinion was repeatedly expressed by others on the squad. One afternoon one of our Spanish teachers happened to be in the auditorium when we were practicing. After listening to one of the constructive speeches and rebuttal, she remarked, "I had no idea that debating involved so many subjects. The debaters have to know many things besides debating, don't they?" It is true. For the question of cancellation of war debts, Marion used his knowledge of French to read the French newspapers in order to get true French opinions that had not been garbled by translation and British censorship. It was surprising to find such a difference of opinion in the French and American press. Louise used knowledge of history to find historical examples of debt cancellation or repudiation. Earle brought into play his knowledge of economic laws gained from his course in economics. Lisle furnished the material about validity of contracts from his work in commercial law. Donald's knowledge of commercial geography helped tremendously in working out points about payment in goods. It was Norma's mathematics which worked out percentages and interest, and compiled statistical results. Dorothy's course in civics and current topics furnished a valuable background for conditions in European and American politics. All of the debaters had the pleasure of correlating their knowledge from at least five different courses of studies, and some of them used more. All of them used their knowledge of English in outlining, in writing their speeches, and

in extempore speaking for rebuttal. Nothing can be more stimulating to scholarship than this practical application of knowledge.

Not only does debating utilize *old* knowledge, but it also leads directly to *new* material. The average High School student may or may not become familiar with four or five magazines, while the debater must become familiar with many. For example, Dorothy spent four Saturdays, Lisle six, and Earle an equal number working in the magazine and civics rooms of our Public Library. If they had been writing a paper for a specific course, they would have been satisfied with reading articles in three or four different magazines, but the bigness of the question and the importance of the occasion for which they were preparing led them to read every magazine on which they could lay their hands. Besides all of the current weeklies, they became familiar with "'Asia." "The Sunset Magazine," "The Wall Street Journal," "Bankers Magazine," "Atlantic Monthly," "Review of Reviews," "North American Review," et cetera through the list. These were read not only once but also throughout the entire year. Furthermore the habit of magazine reading carries on after debating season. Marion declares that she would not now be reading "The Survey," "The Literary Digest," or "The Woman Citizen," if it were not for the introduction to them which she received in debating, while Harold asserts that he always considered "The Atlantic Monthly" and Littell's "Living Age" too highbrow for him, until he began reading them for debating. Any activity which develops such an interest in current magazines in our voters of tomorrow is well worth the time and effort expended on it.

A third benefit of debating is the discovery of new sources of material. After the debaters have utilized their own knowledge, after they have read everything within reach, after they have practically exhausted the Reader's Guide and other similar aids, they turn to new fields. The critic who says that debating makes students too dependent on their coach has never worked with a squad of alive, alert twentieth century boys and girls. Instead of always leading, the coach sometimes finds herself struggling to keep pace with their new ideas. When we were debating the Philippine question, Dorothy and Norma decided to interview a certain pastor who had just returned from the Islands; Dorothy interviewed two teachers who had taught in our Island possession, while Earle wrote letters to two University professors who were experts on the

question. During our study of cancellation of war debts, Marion rushed in one day with the announcement that he had just had the most interesting interview with the French consul in our city who was eager to talk with him about France, and had also promised him more material. This led to a similar interview with the British consul. All of the debaters attended lectures on the Philippines, France, the Ruhr, and other world problems. All of this was done almost entirely independently of the coach. My only contribution was the suggestion that they might learn something by attending a certain lecture; the remainder of the activity was original with the students themselves, and was the spontaneous outgrowth of their interest in debating.

A fourth beneficial result from inter-school debating is the inculcation of respect for evidence. Last year when I asked twenty High School students what they considered the three greatest benefits derived from debating, fifteen answered "a demand for proof." A student who has known the joys of a season of inter-school debating has nothing but disgust for vague statements, high sounding phrases, meaningless platitudes and glittering generalities. Debating more than anything else instills in students a demand for definite statements which are supported by facts. The debater thinks for himself, but he demands thinking which is supported by evidence. Debating trains people to weigh evidence, evaluate it, scrutinize its source, discount the unworthy, and utilize the worthy. This training functions in everything from village gossip to world problems. Any high school debater will testify, as they have done to me dozens of times, that debating more than anything else has taught him to abandon unsupported assertions in his own speech, and also to question and to weigh carefully anything that he reads and all that he hears. If all of our voters could have this invaluable training, politicians would not dare make the vague, ambiguous appeals for which they are noted, and if politicians would only use the rules of evidence which our high school debaters practice, intelligent voters would not be compelled to cast their ballots without knowing whether or not they are voting as they believe. A respect for proof, a demand for facts, a knowledge of evidence, and a love of truth insofar as it can be ascertained by us mortals constitute one of the most valuable results of inter-school debating.

A fifth benefit which challenges our attention is training in organization. Repeatedly debaters have told me how much or-

ganizing debate points has helped them to outline their work in other courses, how it has aided them in grasping the salient points of a lecture. Teachers verify this assertion. Last year Dorothy was appointed by her civics teacher to plan the outline of a series of speeches in her class, because, as the teacher said, Dorothy knew how to *organize* the subject matter better than did the remainder of the class because of her training in inter-school debates. The same task befell Norma in her English class for the same reason. To quote again from my questionnaire, about the three greatest benefits from debating, eighteen of the twenty stated, "the ability to organize my material." Last spring one of the inter-school debaters was scheduled for a debate in debating society. One of her colleagues remarked, "It will be easy for you. After all your experience on the school team, you needn't do anything but get up and talk." Very indignantly the debater replied, "I wouldn't disgrace myself or the team by just rambling around. Of course I shall brief the material and organize it." Any one who has listened to the scores of rambling, ununified, disorganized speeches which are inflicted upon the American public will appreciate the value of organization of material which is learned in the debating school of experience.

Thus far no mention has been made of the benefits which debating contributes to a student's delivery. The oration, declamation, and dramatics train students in the delivery of set lines, but it is debating which furnishes the background for extempore speaking. It is one thing to deliver a memorized composition well; it is quite another to speak fluently when one's exact words have not been committed before the contest. Debating is one of the best methods of overcoming stage-fright. Many a student who would never have the courage to speak alone is encouraged by the presence of his colleagues in debate. For example, Baxter was so timid that he turned white whenever he was asked to rise and read in class during his freshman year. Town people said, "That boy can never debate. He is too timid. He wouldn't dare say a word in public." However we knew that Baxter was a thinker and a worker, and that he had brains. Strengthened by school loyalty and the support of his colleagues, he agreed to debate. The first night was torture. He kept himself together by locking his hands tightly behind his back. Yet he did so well that his friends were surprised and pleased. The second debate he did better, but he was still pain-

fully frightened. After the fifth debate he gained enough confidence to let his arms hang at his sides part of the time instead of fastening them in a death grip at his back. At the state championship debate Baxter was pointed out by one of the judges as the best speaker of the six on the platform. Beginners are afraid of rebuttal, but after two or three contests, the debaters cry for rebuttal. They are eager for the give and take, the rapid-fire, the quick planning of refutation. It is this phase of debating and fluency in extempore speaking which will remain a most valuable asset throughout their lives.

Still another benefit which must not be overlooked is the development of increased respect for scholarship. High School boys and girls are human like the rest of us. When they look around at their classmates and see the honors accorded them for athletic prowess, they often say, "What is the use? Being a good football player or a track star is more important than studying. I may as well take life easy." These are familiar words to all secondary school teachers. Commencement honors are a long way off, and scholarship seems rather trivial and unimportant. One method of eliminating this attitude is inter-school debating with its attendant honors. It is an academic activity based on regular school studies. Its honors mean as much as, and in some schools more than, do athletic rewards. When a student body knows that its debaters have received medals, school letters, letters of congratulation from a Representative in Congress, or that its chosen Websters have been the guests of honor at a theater party, a literary banquet, a dinner from the faculty, or at a school rally, their respect for things intellectual is tremendously increased. They learn that study may have objective as well as subjective rewards.

There are still other benefits which must be passed over hastily. Inter-school debating develops respect for time. In a class discussion one may talk overtime at the forbearance of the class and patience of the teacher, but in all inter-school contests the time is set, the gavel sounds, and woe to him who continues speaking. Inter-school debating develops student interest in public questions which they must help solve in the future. But no team will get out of debating more than it puts in, and no team will put in to the work more than the standards of its coach demand. This brings us to the question of methods in coaching.

In coaching a team, the first thing to be considered is tryouts. The first year it may be difficult to bring out as many students as you wish, but eventually you will have plenty of material. The debaters may try out through their English classes, or debating society, or by signing up with the coach for a series of contests. We have discovered that the latter is the better process. Debate try-outs are advertised three or four weeks before the day for signing up, through the agency of our school paper, bulletin-board announcements, and speeches in the grade rooms. Every student in the tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades who is doing passing work in three-fourths of his courses is eligible. As a rule high school students in their first year are too young and immature to be desirable material. After a sufficient number have signed up, they are asked to prepare three minute arguments on any subject they choose for the first try-out. The second try-out comes a week later with speeches of four minutes on the question to be debated. The third week's try-out is held with speeches of five minutes length, and three minutes of rebuttal for each speaker. The fourth and final try-out takes place the fourth week and involves speeches of six minutes length with four minutes rebuttal. This is the time when the judges worry about the wisdom of their choice. If there is practically a tie between two speeches, we conduct a fifth try-out with a new set of judges. The number eliminated at each try-out depends, of course, upon the number who enter in the first place. If we have thirty people trying out the first day, we eliminate six, leaving twenty-four for the second, eighteen for the third, and twelve for the fourth week. Experience has taught me to have a number of teachers for judges rather than to rely on my own judgment alone. If I had relied solely on my own judgment, we should have lost one of the best high school debaters that Detroit has ever known. Variety of judgment is usually safest; on the other hand, it is wise to choose for judges those teachers who know most about the principles of public speaking. Sometimes we have five, sometimes seven; we try to keep the same group throughout the series.

Please note the word "series." Too much cannot be said in favor of a series of try-outs instead of only one or two. A month gives the coach a chance to become well acquainted with the squad; it reveals the weaklings who are out for much honor and no work, or those who never stick to anything long enough to progress; it leaves a residue of people who really want to debate. The race is

not always to the swift. Many times those who start well end badly, and vice versa. It is the latter whom we want for debaters, the plucky ones who will work and fail and fail and work, until finally they achieve. Last year our principal and I were fully convinced that a certain girl would make the team. She went through the first three try-outs with flying colors; her fourth was a distinct failure. In view of her previous record, we gave her a fifth chance but the result was the same. A few weeks revealed the fact that the girl was exceedingly nervous and could never have stayed on, if she had made a place. If the try-outs had been hasty, this girl would have made the team, would have been compelled to withdraw, and would thus have furnished conspicuous evidence for those who say that debating is too strenuous.

Even after debaters have outdistanced their fellow-students on the platform, there are several other necessary tests. Is the student *physically* strong enough to carry such an activity in addition to his regular work? Is his *scholarship* record high enough to recommend him? Is he *dependable?* Is he capable of *hard work?* "Yes" will be the answer to all of these questions, for most of the faithful who have withstood the onslaught of four try-outs. If you find one who does not meet these acid tests, both the coach and the team are better off without him. I remember too well one boy whom we let slide into a debating team on his reputation. He was exceedingly clever and the school pet; consequently everyone thought he would make a good debater. He thought so too. He refused to work, had his mind on a dozen other activities, and nearly ruined the morale of his team. The day of the debate his cleverness and supreme self-confidence did *not* carry him through. He made a mess of everything from his constructive speech to rebuttal, so much so that even he had to admit it. A high school debating team is no place for the over-confident, the indolent, the unreliable, those poor in scholarship, or for the physically weak. As soon as a debating coach has learned this, and practices it even in the face of faculty opposition, he has diminished his problems by half.

Another point to be considered at the time of try-outs is the alternate. A team may go through a whole season without using the alternate in any way. Our teams did this two years, but it is rather unsatisfactory, because, if anything does happen to a member of the team, the alternate is so wholly unprepared that he cannot do justice to himself or his colleagues. Again we have tried

having one alternate attend debate practices, participate in rebuttal, and aid the team generally. This is successful if you have an alternate who is willing to work hard, when he is practically sure that he will not participate in a debate. Last year we tried having second teams composed of three alternates each. With this system one is sure of having one alternate ready to replace any member of the first team, the second teams get and give real rebuttal training in their practice debates with the first team, a larger number of students are being trained in debate, more people are being prepared for the following year, and the additional work for the coach is more than offset by the aid which the second teams render. Again, however, there is the difficulty of persuading high school boys and girls that second place is desirable. They are even more sensitive about playing second place than are college students. We partially solved the problem by giving them an inter-school debate with another second team as a goal toward which they could work. The question of handling alternates is largely a matter of tact. There is no doubt that every high school debating team needs alternates, sometimes directly and always indirectly.

The amount of time which intervenes between the final choice of the team and the first debate is one of the most important considerations of coaching. This period should be at least eight weeks in length, while nine weeks is preferable. Although it is desirable to coach a college team in six weeks or perhaps less, high school students require a longer training because some of them have never been on the debate platform before, and all of them have a more limited background of political, sociological, civic, economic, and historical facts than do college debaters. Five years of observation of my own and other teams have convinced me that eight weeks are absolutely the minimum for sound preparation for a high school debate. Plenty of coaches attempt to do the work in two or three weeks, and then wonder why their teams are not more successful. Hasty, sketchy, half-prepared work may win now and then, but in the long run success comes most frequently to careful preparation. I recall with a smile the first debate that I coached. We spent exactly two weeks in preparation. Two of the team had never heard an inter-school debate of any sort, while the third member had never even come in contact with a class debate. Another jolt came when one of the debaters finally made clear to me the

fact that she did not know the meaning of the term, minimum wage, which was the question for debate. It required part of the first week to explain to her the meaning and background of the word, and the remainder of the time to train her to pronounce it. She insisted on saying, "minium wage." Because the three debaters were naturally bright students, they gave their main speeches creditably, and managed to pull through rebuttal. You will probably agree that we received the two votes of the 2 to 1 decision, not because our team was well prepared or doing excellent debating, but by chance. They *happened* to be better than the opposing team; they were not *prepared* to be. The defeated debaters came from a community ten times the size of ours, and were over-confident. Hence, our victory. After the worries of those two strenuous weeks, I resolved never to put another team on the platform without two months of painstaking preparation. The results have more than justified the resolution.

High school debaters like to have a definite schedule, and they have more respect for a coach who insists that they live up to the dates set, than they have for the instructor who lets them dawdle along haphazardly until the last two weeks.

The first week should be devoted to finding the issues and to distributing them among the members of the team. Some coaches assume this responsibility, which is a grave mistake. Rather have the teams discuss what *they think* the issues are at their first meeting. Then at a second meeting, after more discussion based on the ten or more points which each debater has brought, let them decide the three, four, or five main points to be proved. At the end of the first week each speaker should know what is to be his major point and what position on the team he is to have. Of course shifting is sometimes necessary, but usually the debater is placed for the season.

The second week gives every debater his opportunity to collect new evidence for his own particular points. It is wise to hold team meetings in order to check up on the progress made and to offer criticisms of the evidence found. A coach should meet the team at least three times during this week, and will, of course, be sought out by his debaters for aid at other times. Here again the high school coach must hold more conferences than are necessary for the college coach.

The third week should see the brief written by every member. The coach should present a definite form for the brief and insist that the debaters follow it. Otherwise half of its value for checking inconsistencies, and arranging points in their logical order, is gone. By all means insist that every debater put *every iota of his evidence* into the brief.

Speeches should be written the fourth week. They should also be criticized by the coach and revised by the student by the end of the week. If ten minutes is the length of the constructive speeches, a student should save from two to three minutes for rebuttal at the beginning in order to show the relationship between his speech and that of the preceding speaker, and in order to give continuity to the entire contest. This is the practice of our best debaters, and experience has proved that with training high school debaters enjoy and profit by this plan.

Debaters must memorize their seven or eight minutes of constructive speech thoroughly. There is nothing more pitiable than a speaker who forgets what he wants to say, unless it is the amateur actor who stumbles haltingly through his lines with an embarrassing period of silence after every paragraph. The very least that any high school debater can do is to learn what he is going to say thoroughly. Some coaches encourage the use of cards, but I never yet saw a high school team who used them without giving to the cards the attention which belonged to the audience.

After the speeches are memorized, work on delivery begins. That means particular attention to standing position, directness, and gestures. It means constant attention to loudness and clearness of tone, emphasis, pausing, enunciation, and pronunciation. Any coach, no matter how inexperienced, owes it to his team to be a crank, if need be, on pronouncing words correctly and enunciating distinctly.

The last three weeks of rebuttal are unadulterated joy to those who love argument. We have at least three, if not more, complete debates each week with the teams sitting at their respective tables, the alternates acting as time-keepers, the gavel sounding at the appointed times, and *no interruptions*. Sometimes on other days we abandon main speeches altogether, and have rebuttal on a single point until that is exhausted, and then treat other points in the same manner. On still other days we discuss the points which our

opponents may raise, and plan lines of attack. Sometimes, but rarely of course, the coach takes the platform and represents the opposition. The debaters enjoy this variety.

Much of the success of any rebuttal work is dependent upon the card index system which high school boys and girls thoroughly enjoy. One year we had one box for the three debaters, but it seems more practical for each debater to have his own box and cards. They also are aided by a division of labor; each debater is responsible for certain points in rebuttal. For example, when the question of the Ruhr came up in connection with the proposition of cancellation of war debts, Norma knew that she was to answer that point, because she had worked out a better refutation than her two colleagues. It is helpful to have each debater particularly responsible for the points of one speech of his opponents. For example, let the first affirmative be responsible for every point mentioned by the first negative speaker. This method fixes responsibility, and permits those who have not yet spoken to concentrate on their own speeches. However, this is by no means to be interpreted as an *absolute* division of labor; every debater must listen carefully to every speech. On the other hand, the debaters have often stated that they liked the plan as a general rule of procedure. Rebuttal means hunting for fallacies, searching for inconsistencies, and answering evidence with evidence that is still more convincing. The best results are obtained when you have either two first teams, or a second team with which to actually debate. Not theory, but practice, practice, practice makes successful rebuttal! If it is impossible to have two teams, the alternate and the coach must furnish the opposition, for opposition there must be! Any debating team which has had three weeks of consistent rebuttal practice will revel in the intellectual exhilaration of mental combat, instead of weakly wondering, "What shall we say in rebuttal?"

No debate coaching is honorable which ignores the ethics of the game. Debaters must learn from their coach that juggling statistics, quoting only favorable parts of a passage, and using evidence whose source is either unknown or unworthy are beneath the honor of any participant. They must learn that the ethics of the game demand that a decision once given be final, and subject to no repeal.

The high school coach who completely ignores the physical side of his team is also doing them an injustice. The debaters do not realize that from one to six months' work on a given subject requires physical as well as mental endurance. The coach does, or should. Having chosen the physically strong, the coach should do his best to keep them fit. Many a time my debaters have ridiculed the idea. Many of them have exclaimed in disgust, "Oh, I am so tired of hearing 'Nine hours sleep, three meals a day, and some time out-of-doors.'" At the end of the season those same debaters have appreciated the demand, while their parents have thanked me most heartily. Loss of sleep, food, and fresh air will ruin the best of debaters. Never yet have I known a single high school debater who lived up to these rules to break down physically. This is partly due to the fact that they were coached to believe that debating like athletics demands physical fitness.

Any coach has missed half of his chance for success when he ignores the principle of team-work. From the very first, help them to realize that the three are one, working together on one side for one purpose. Whatever is said by one member commits the whole team. Like the British Cabinet, they rise and fall together. Train them to believe that their greatest success will come through the subordination of the individual to the team, that it is the team and the team pulling together that wins. When victory comes, it is earned, not by one speaker, but by the team. The conceited prodigy whose cleverness demands the whole platform has no place in debating. Defeat, victory, and work must be shared equally by the three, if debating is to achieve its best results.

Debate coaching means hours, days, weeks and months of concentrated effort, of hard work. How many hours it demands, I have twice set out to determine. Two years I started to keep an accurate account of the hours which I spent coaching our high school debating teams. Each year the game became so absorbing that I unconsciously stopped counting the cost, before the season was half finished. What better testimonial could one ask? Debate coaching in high school means the sacrifice of some social pleasures. It means less leisure to read some of the books for which we teachers are eternally trying to find time. It means the expenditure of tremendous physical strength. It sometimes means a bitter defeat which the coach feels as keenly as the team. Even so, de-

bate coaching is one of the richest fields in high school training. To the high school debating coach is given the glorious opportunity of knowing intimately three, six, nine or twelve of the school's most promising students. Contact with their alert minds, splendid scholarship, eager fancies, and inspiring hopes for the future is reward enough. With few exceptions, the debating coach may, if he will, have the pick of the school. Having the best is his challenge to do his best. The sheer fun of coaching, the pleasure of intellectual stimulation, and the joy of rich friendships compel all of us to say with Barrie's Admirable Crichton, "We will play the game" in defeat or victory.

RHETORIC AND POETRY*

HOYT H. HUDSON
Swarthmore College

YOU will recall that James Russell Lowell, in his *Fable for Critics*, includes a passage of self-characterization, beginning with these lines:

> There is Lowell, who's striving Parnassus to climb,
> With a whole bale of *isms* tied together with rhyme.
> He might get on alone, spite of brambles and boulders,
> But he can't with that bundle he has on his shoulders.
> The top of the hill he will ne'er come nigh reaching
> Till he learns the distinction 'twixt singing and preaching.

It is this "distinction 'twixt singing and preaching" which is my theme in what follows. I wish to urge that the distinction is an important one in literary criticism; I would urge especially that we who claim to know something about preaching have as great an interest in making clear the distinction, and can contribute as much to this end, as the student of "pure literature," whose attitude toward preaching too often lacks both sympathy and understanding. Recently I found a journalistic critic referring, with an air of having said something important, to "rhetoric, that borderland between prose and poetry." I fancy that a large collection might be made of such vague impressionistic contributions to obscurity. But such is not our present task.

* Read at the Cincinnati Convention, December, 1923.

Rather let us turn to the words of one who thought clearly upon our subject, John Stuart Mill, in one of whose early essays[1] we find these sentences:

> All poetry is of the nature of soliloquy. It may be said that poetry which is printed on hot-pressed paper and sold at a bookseller's shop, is a soliloquy in full dress and on the stage. But there is nothing absurd in such a mode of soliloquizing. What we have said to ourselves we may tell to others afterward; what we have said or done in solitude, we may voluntarily reproduce when we know that other eyes are upon us. But no trace of consciousness that any eyes are upon us must be visible in the work itself. . . . When he [the poet] turns round and addresses himself to another person; when the act of utterance is not in itself the end, but a means to an end—viz. by the feelings he himself expresses, to work upon the feelings, or upon the belief, or the will, of another,—when the expression of his emotions, or of his thoughts tinged by his emotions, is tinged also by that purpose, by that desire of making an impression upon another mind, then it ceases to be poetry, and becomes eloquence.

Mill sums up his thought in the famous apothegm, "Eloquence is written to be heard, poetry to be overheard." I trust I do no violence to his thought when I substitute for "eloquence" the word "rhetoric."[2]

We have, then, on the one hand rhetoric, of which the most typical example is the persuasive public address; on the other hand poetry, represented in its purest form, perhaps, by the personal lyric. Mill has characterized, in the passage just quoted, the work of the poet. The rhetorician stands at the opposite pole. He composes his discourse with his eye upon his audience and occasion. The occasion may dictate his very subject; and it may well be a subject quite other than that he would have chosen if left to himself.[3]

[1] *Early Essays by John Stuart Mill*, edited by J. W. M. Gibbs (London, 1897), p. 209.

[2] Prof. Fred Newton Scott, in his well-known article, "The Most Fundamental Differentia of Poetry and Prose" (*Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XIX, 250), goes further and practically substantiates "prose" for Mill's "eloquence," concluding that "poetry is communication in language for expression's sake; prose is expression in language for communication's sake." The present writer has drawn, as one must in discussing this subject, upon Professor Scott's article; but he believes that Mill's apothegm expresses more accurately the distinction between rhetoric and poetry than that between prose and poetry.

[3] Compare Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (Welldon's translation, I, iii): "For a speech is composed of three elements, viz. the speaker, the subject of the speech, and the persons addressed; and the end or object of the speech is determined by the last, viz. by the audience."

The audience is likely to be a certain limited group. The man of rhetoric must test himself at every step by such questions as, "What will this mean to them?" "Will they be ready for this step?" and "How can this be illustrated so as to show its connection with their interests?" Thus the structure, too, of his discourse will be determined by his audience. Taking the exordium as an illustration, we can see that its length, its subject-matter, and even the necessity for having any exordium at all, will depend upon the audience and occasion.

Moreover, the rhetorician wants actually to do something with the audience—and usually something quite specific. Lincoln's Gettysburg speech is sometimes described as if it were a poetical discourse by a man who had brooded much in solitude, and who disregarded or "rose above" the occasion in order to express universal truths and emotions. Without denying the element of universality in this speech, we must say that what Lincoln did was to seize the occasion, with its already deep emotional associations, and to utilize all the elements of it in the performance of his task of persuading the members of his audience to help carry on the war. From our point of view, now that the occasion for such persuasion is past, we can fit the speech into its historical and biographical setting and read it very much as we read a speech in a drama, and with a similar delight. But at the time it was a piece of persuasive discourse with a very specific end in view.

The poet, as Wordsworth reminds us, keeps his eye not on the audience or the occasion, but on his subject: his subject fills his mind and engrosses his imagination, so that he is compelled, by excess of admiration or other emotion, to tell of it; compelled, though no one hear or read his utterance. It is not only sorrow that must be given words; it is not only grief which, if it does not speak,

> Whispers the o'erfraught heart and bids it break.

And so we find Wordsworth defining poetry as "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings." And so we find Tennyson writing,

> I do but sing because I must,
> And pipe but as the linnets sing.

and Shelley: "A poet is a nightingale, who sits in darkness and sings to cheer its own solitude with sweet sounds; his auditors are as men entranced by the melody of an unseen musician, who feel

that they are moved and softened, yet know not whence or why."

For the moment, then, we shall say that poetry is for the sake of expression; the impression on others is incidental. Rhetoric is for the sake of impression; the expression is secondary—an indispensable means.

As an example of how this distinction may be applied in literary criticism, I might point to A. A. Jack's very discerning estimate of Byron; Jack concludes that most of Byron's writing should be considered as rhetorical rather than poetical discourse. Following are a few sentences which suggest how he arrived at this conclusion:[4]

> He [Byron] has his eye always on his audience and is always directly addressing someone. And this is the root difference between the poet strictly so called and the orator. Poetry is a record of feeling; oratory is an appeal, based of course on emotional experience, but meant to excite feeling. . . . Great oratory, and Byron's is superbly great, forces a contact between the emotions of the audience and the emotions of the speaker. Poetry displays its own heart. Oratory tears open the heart of listener. . . . We have not to say [of Byron] "How different from Wordsworth." We have to say, "How much better than Patrick Henry."

Again, we might notice the following interesting passage in Dorothy Canfield's recent *Raw Material:*

> My clergyman grandfather always said that he never enjoyed any sermons so much as the ones he preached to himself sitting under another clergyman's pulpit. When the text was given out, his mind seized on it with a vivid fresh interest and, running rapidly away from the intrusive sound of the other preacher's voice, wove a tissue of clear, strong, and fascinatingly interesting reasoning and exhortations. Grandfather used to say that such sermons preached to himself were in the nature of things much better than any he could ever deliver in church. "I don't have to keep a wary eye out for stupid old Mrs. Ellsworth, who never understands anything light or fanciful; I don't have to remember to thunder, occasionally at stolid Mr. Peters to wake him up. I don't have to remember to keep my voice raised so that deaf old Senator Peasley can hear me. I am not obliged to hold the wandering attention of their muddled heads by a series of foolish little rhetorical tricks or by a prodigious effort of my personality."

In other words, what Miss Canfield's grandfather was saying is that in him the poetical impulse was stronger and afforded more pleasure than the rhetorical impulse. To a man who was more completely a rhetorician the shortcomings of his audience would be a stimulus and a challenge; the manipulation of what he calls

[4] *Poetry and Prose*, Being Essays on Modern English Poetry (New York, 1912) pp. 136–137.

"foolish little rhetorical tricks" would be a pleasureable exercise of power.

But now, having enforced this distinction (which seems to me of primary importance) between poetry and rhetoric, we should not fail to take into account all possible qualifications of it. First we may recall that in the *Poetics,* when Aristotle discusses the element of *dianoia,* or thought, in tragedy, he says, "we may assume what is said in the *Rhetoric,* to which inquiry the subject more strictly belongs." He goes on: "Under Thought is included every effect which has to be produced by speech, the subdivisions being,—proof and refutation; the excitation of the feelings, such as pity, fear, anger, and the like; the suggestion of importance or its opposite."[5] We recognize that in poetry in its broad sense, especially in dramatic and narrative poetry, there are a great many occasions when the poet must picture a character as trying to produce an effect by speech. On such occasions the character will use rhetoric, and for the time being the poet is writing persuasive discourse. Familiar examples drawn from English literature are the speech of Mark Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* and the speeches of the fallen angels in Books I and II of *Paradise Lost.* Yet we should not say that in these cases the poet is any less a poet, even though for the moment he is working in the field of rhetoric. He is producing what we properly may call imitative rhetoric. He is representing "men in action," and since persuasive address is a common form of action he must represent it. Thus many of the poets have shown themselves masters of the persuasive art, and their imitative rhetoric deserves to be studied for its own sake. Yet the presence of this kind of writing in poetry does nothing, as we see, to break down our distinction between poetry and rhetoric. Rather it shows the broad scope of the poet's art; it bears out Ben Jonson's account of the education of the poet, wherein he brings him "down through the disciplines of grammar, logic, rhetoric, and the ethics," and later says: "He must have civil prudence and eloquence, and that whole, not taken up by snatches or pieces in sentences or remnants when he will handle business or carry counsels."[6]

A fact harder to deal with, yet one which must not be left

[5] XIX, 1 (Butcher's translation).

[6] *Timber or Discoveries Made upon Men and Matter* (Schelling's edition), p. 78.

unconsidered, is that there is to be detected, in any extended poetical work, a rhetorical element. The poet does not always do as we have described him doing: he does at times consider his audience. Granting that our previous account may suffice for poetry in a very restricted meaning,—for the "touchstones," let us say, and for most subjective works such as personal lyrics, yet it certainly does not suffice for the drama. Except for what has come to be called "closet drama," the poet's work in this species is designed for an audience as surely as is the orator's. And in greater or less measure, the same holds true for other of the species of poetry—for narrative, for the ode, certainly for didactic and satirical pieces.

Yet there are differences plainly discernible between the poet's audience and the orator's, and between the poet's relation to his audience and the orator's to his. The poet thinks of a more general and more vaguely defined audience than the orator. The poet may even think of all mankind of the present and future as his audience; or if he writes to address a certain class of readers, at least he chooses his own audience instead of submitting to the dictates of an occasion. Where this is not true, where the poet is writing an ode for a special occasion, a tribute to the royal family upon the king's birthday or an address of greeting to a visiting celebrity, I think we shall not hesitate to apply our distinction rigorously and to say that he writes rhetorical discourse rather than poetical. A study of the duties of "public orator" at English universities in past centuries shows that the writing of Latin verse to be read at special occasions was one of the common tasks of this skilled rhetorician. Returning to the poet, we find that he is likely to think of himself as a fair representative of mankind and write to please himself, trusting thereby to please others—which is equivalent to taking no account of his audience at all.

One cannot hope to find better authority on this point than Wordsworth, who wrote in his preface to *Lyrical Ballads*:[7]

> The poet writes under one restriction only, namely, the necessity of giving immediate pleasure to a human Being possessed of that information which may be expected from him, not as a lawyer, a physician, a mariner, an astronomer, or a natural philosopher, but as a Man.

We have here an important clue to follow in ascertaining the poet's relation to his audience, namely, his reason for taking the audience

[7] *Wordsworth's Literary Criticism*, edited by Nowell C. Smith (London, 1905), p. 23.

into account. He desires to please, or delight, his readers. We are now thrown back to the doctrine which we used as a starting-point; we were inclined to say at first that the poet's end is expression, and that impression enters only incidentally. Now we are told that the poet writes under "the necessity of giving immediate pleasure to a human Being." Perhaps, however, we can give due weight to his desire, or necessity, to delight his readers and still cling to our original doctrine. Let us analyze a simple case of the impulse to expression. We have had an exciting experience, perhaps with some comic elements; our experience fills our mind for some time after its occurrence. We say to ourselves, "I must tell some one about it!" We are impelled to tell the first acquaintance we meet. But perhaps we do not obey that impulse, thinking, "I'll wait and tell A. He'll enjoy it more than any one else." It seems to me that still the primary impulse is that to expression; our telling is "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings." But the impulse requires us to *share* our feelings, and we feel the need of a hearer who will find pleasure in what we have to tell. We should notice, however, that the impulse to express still arises from the subject; the subject, not the audience, fills the mind and quickens the imagination. Thus the poet tends to look for an audience suitable to his subject and the resultant discourse, rather than to seek, as does the rhetorician, a subject and discourse suitable to the audience.

Accepting pleasure as the effect (or kind of impression) peculiar to poetry, we may name persuasion as the effect peculiar to rhetoric. There is, however, another effect which has come to be associated, perhaps indissolubly, with rhetorical discourse; that is the effect produced by *display*. Historically, rhetorical display grew up in connection with the epideiktic branch of oratory, the delivery of eulogies, panegyrics, and denunciations. Epideiktic rhetoric originally had a genuine basis of persuasion, drawing upon the topics of honor and shame, praise and censure. But the conventionality of the occasions for its use and the factitious nature of the persuasive problems on these occasions led such speaking in the direction I have indicated. And in all ages when there have been few opportunities for political and religious discussion, oratory has tended to flow in this channel of display. Rhetoric becomes then a study of how to vary a phrase, how to turn a compliment,

write certain kinds of letters, and declaim ornate speeches. Order of words, with regard to emphasis and balance, clever paradox and specious reasoning, beauty and variety of figures and tropes, dignity and sonorousness of language,—such become matters of greatest concern.

Such manifestations of rhetoric have done much to degrade the whole subjest in the eyes of philosophic thinkers and in the common opinion of mankind; so that one of the commonest uses of the word is with the meaning, "artificial eleganee of language, or declamation without conviction or earnest feeling." The tendency to epideiktic display at various times has infected prose style, producing such results as Euphuism. When this rhetorical tendency has invaded poetry, it has placed a premium upon the "conceit," upon intricate and rigid rhyme-schemes and metrical patterns, upon word-juggling (as in the anagrammatic and punning verses of the Elizabethan period), and upon bombast (as in the "heroic plays" of Dryden and others).

We should not deny, to be sure, that there is a legitimate pleasure to be experienced on the part of a reader or hearer in perceiving the skill of the poet or speaker. Yet this is always in a subsidiary relation to the other impressions we have noted, and does not necessarily rise to distinct consciousness. As has been said,[8] "The pleasure we take in poetry rarely rests on the conscious perception of technical skill, but usually on an unconscious perception of order like that of nature in which the rigid law of uniformity is modified by variations which suggest the law without following it slavishly." And whatever may be the pleasure of the reader, I believe we should agree that the desire to make a display of skill should never enter into the poet's impulse. Even with a rhetorician such a process, as we know, is likely to result in a degradation of his art; and most of the products of epideiktic rhetoric we should place among the lowest orders of literature,[9] if indeed we admit them at all.

To return to our main line of thought, we have established, or perhaps granted, that there is a legitimate rhetorical element in poetry. It might be interesting to consider gradations in the

[8] Johnson, C. F., *Forms of English Poetry* (New York, 1904), p. 18.

[9] There are honorable exceptions, such the the funeral orations of Bosseut and Massillon.

strength of this element in the various species of poetical discourse. We can hardly hope to draw up a table of mathematical exactness, or to make any generalization which is not open to exception. But we should probably agree that most free from the rhetorical element, as being most purely expression and best concerned with impression, are the personal or subjective lyric and the rhapsodic poem. Next I should place the idyll, pastoral poetry, and after them the whole field of narrative poetry, including the romance and the epic. In these the consideration of the audience is generally less than in dramatic poetry. Of comedy and tragedy I should say that comedy is more rhetorical in its conception than tragedy. Comedy is much more likely to be local and topical, is more apt for propaganda and persuasion. Still further than dramatic poetry in the direction of rhetoric, we shall find didactic poetry, satire, odes for special occasions, and epigrams.

The question may occur whether our ranking of poetical species according to the strength of the rhetorical element corresponds (inversely, of course) to their ranking poetic excellence. Can we say that the personal lyric, being least rhetorical, is the highest kind of poetry? I believe modern taste would incline to this view. Aristotle, as we know, placed tragedy highest. He demanded a certain grandeur in the action represented, a demand satisfied only by tragedy and the epic. Tragedy is greater than the epic because it has all the elements of the epic with others in addition. This suggests that Aristotle may have admired tragedy as some modern critics have admired grand opera, because it is a "union of all the arts." And from this we might draw the further suggestion that the presence of the rhetorical element, or rather of a rhetorical necessity in the very form of a poetical composition, may heighten rather than degrade the composition. The tragedian may write the better poetry for having to make his lines impressive as well as expressive. In composing an elegy upon the death of a friend, a poet is faced by a complex problem: he is writing a poem for an occasion, and he is constrained to fall into the rhetorical conventions which have grown up about such occasions; on the other hand his feelings may be so strong that he will forget his audience and give vent to private grief, probably with incongruous and distasteful results. But where the difficulties are transcended and exactly the right proportions are maintained, the result is a *Lycidas*

or *Thyrsis* or *Adonais*, and belongs to a high order of poetry. Of the three elegies named, I should say that *Thyrsis* leans toward the side of personal feelings, and errs, if at all, in being too subjective; *Adonais* leans toward the rhetorical to such a point at times we question the warmth and genuineness of the author's emotion; *Lycidas* avoids both pitfalls.

Turning to less disputable regions of our inquiry, we shall not find it difficult to cite works wherein a poet has got clear across the borderland into rhetoric, and has unmistakably written rhetorical discourse. First we might mention pieces written with a persuasive end, though claiming the style of imitative literature. Prose fiction in our generation has suffered from a flood of novels written by propagandists, rhetoricians who utilize the devices and factors of interestingness peculiar to imitative literature in the service of some project dear to their hearts.[10] This phenomenon is too well-known to need discussion. It is found also on the stage. I believe that when we apply our findings regarding poetry and rhetoric to Bernard Shaw, we discover that in most of his work he belongs with the rhetoricians rather than with the dramatic poets. We should, of course, make the allowances due him, remembering that he is a writer of comedies and clever in the use of what we have called imitative rhetoric. But aside from these considerations, we find him, as revealed in his plays as well as in his prefaces, a preacher or reformer more often than a creative artist This is not necessarily a condemnation of Shaw's work. The preacher has a high function. He is to be praised rather than blamed for using such means of publicity as are available to him. No one thinks less of William Morris for having written *The Dream of John Ball*, a socialist tract in narrative form. But criticism is at fault if the distinction between the rhetorician and the creative artist is lost; and when criticism fails of its duty there is a resulting confusion and loss in literature.

Again, we should call attention to metrical *tours de force*, which, as epideiktic displays, belong to rhetoric rather than to poetry. Without going back to the strained and quaint produets of "metaphysical poets," I would cite Poe's *Bells* and Southey's rhymed description of *How the Waters Come Down at Lodore* as

[10] As the reader, if I still have one, must be aware, the word "poetry" in this paper is used in a broad sense, equivalent to that of the German *Dichtung*, inclusive of all imitative or imaginative, literature.

cases in point. Many of Swinburne's stanzas, with their balanced alliteration and assonance, err in the same direction, suggesting a kind of Euphuism in verse.

We have been considering how a poet may get over into the field of rhetoric. We might now ask, does a rhetorician ever get into the realm of poetry? I believe he does. Though the orator's end is persuasion, it is not hard to believe that there are moments in his discourse when this end is forgotten in his delight or wonder before some image which fills his inner eye. In such moments he has his eye on the subject, not the audience; he is expressing "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings," unrestrained by considerations of the effect he is producing. Although it is hard to be sure when we have such passages in rhetorical discourse, since skilled rhetoricians sometimes feign raptures and give a very good pretense of being carried away by their subject when they are in reality working upon the emotion and will of their audience, I believe there are many sentences in the sermons of John Donne and Jeremy Taylor, to mention only two, where we can say, "Here the poet speaks, rather than the preacher." Such passages in rhetorical discourse might conceivably weaken it as persuasion, since in becoming a poet the orator, as we have said, turns his eye from the audience and occasion to his subject. Thus we treasure many speeches and sermons for reasons quite apart from their persuasive effect either in their own time or in ours.

The supreme example of a rhetorician who became a poet is another preacher of the seventeenth century, John Bunyan. Bunyan was first and last a rhetorician. He was one of the most powerful speakers of his century. He wrote many tracts. And in all his public utterances and his tracts, we are safe in saying, every sentence was informed with a persuasive purpose. Thus his chief work, *Pilgrim's Progress*, was written as a tract, a persuasion to men to be converted. In it he did as we have found some modern rhetoricians doing—he cast his tract into a story, though he used the frankest sort of disguise, that of allegory. But once he had raised his homily into the realm of imagination, so clear were the images before his mind, and such was his delight in them, that he remained throughout almost continuously in the realm of poetry. I say "almost continuously," for I believe that Bunyan's use of imitative rhetoric is so frequent that it fails of verisimilitude; so

that the reader comes to feel that the author is directly addressing persuasion to him rather than representing men in action—as indeed is the case.

There is another way in which a rhetorician may approach the realm of poetry, if indeed he may not enter it. That is by conceiving of his audience as does a poet—not as a limited group gathered for some special occasion, but as all mankind, or as posterity, or as the choice spirits of his own and succeeding ages. This practice, again, is very likely to detract from the immediate persuasive effect of his work, while making it of enduring value. I should name Edmund Burke as a rhetorician of this kind. The orator may be carried still further in the direction of poetry if his subject is one of enduring and universal significance.

To summarize, I have tried to emphasize the distinction between pure poetry and rhetoric, and then to suggest that rarely do we find them pure; that poetry in some of its most usual forms is more or less strongly tinged with a rhetorical element; that criticism will walk with surer feet if it can learn to isolate and analyze this rhetorical element. Hence it follows that a part of the equipment of a literary critic, and, we may add, of an interpreter of literature, must be a knowledge of the devices for getting and holding attention, the technique of adaptation to audience and occasion, which are the stock in trade of teachers of public speaking—in other words those "foolish little rhetorical tricks" which Shakespeare and Milton did not disdain to use.

CRITICISM IN THE CLASSROOM

J. FRED McGREW
Gooding College, Idaho

[EDITOR'S NOTE: As modern education continues to place increasing emphasis upon skill rather than knowledge, upon doing rather than knowing, Speech Education in all its forms is rapidly coming into its own. And as the Speech teacher faces the necessity of developing a certain amount of skill in his students, he is more and more dependent upon his ability to criticise the class work of those students, to pick out the most serious defects in that work, to make helpful suggestions for improvement. In the belief that teachers, especially high school teachers, would welcome any practical contribution which might make toward organized and systematic criticism, and which at the same time might increase the criticising vocabulary, the following suggestive outline as drawn from a paper by J. Fred

McGrew, is here published. It may be adapted for use in any field of speech education.—L. G. R.]

I. THOUGHT.

A. *Purpose.* Has he a definite purpose in mind? Is his material so organized that his purpose is apparent to all?

B. *Choice of subject.* Is the subject interesting? Timely? Worth while? Adapted to the audience? Within the grasp of the speaker?

C. *Material.*

1. Preparation. Has there been investigation, reading? Does he know what he believes? Has his preparation been thorough?
2. Selection. Is the material used in the speech selected with the idea of accomplishing his purpose? It should be abundant, interesting, concrete rather than abstract, new enough to avoid triteness, simple enough to be understood, important enough to demand consideration.
3. Use. Does he hold attention? Is his organization logical? Coherent? Unified? Is there emotional harmony?
   a. Debate. Did he get at the proposition? Has he found the vital issues of the question? His case should be direct, convincing, sufficiently supported by authority, adapted to the case he has to meet, free from fallacious reasoning.
   b. Interpretative Reading and Acting. Has he properly interpreted the printed page? Did he have a full realization of both the logical and emotional content of his words? Has he used his imagination to recreate both situation and character? Has he given a sympathetic interpretation? Has he tried to impersonate when the material properly lends itself only to interpretation? Does he portray the characters clearly, or does he carry forward into the new a part of the mood of the old? Is there sufficient variety in his characterizations?

II. LANGUAGE.

A. *Words.* Is his diction good? Pronunciation correct? Does he resort to slang, street phrases, or colloquialisms? Are his words carefully chosen and of sufficient variety? Does he use words outside of his understsanding?

B. *Sentences.* Is his grammar correct? Is his sentence structure clear? His sentences should be well-balanced and of sufficient variety. His language should be simple, direct, vivid and expressive. He should have some command of figurative and imaginative language.

III. VOICE.

A. *Physical equipment.* Defects in the voice may be traced to poor breathing, too much muscular tension in the throat or jaw, improper resonance, insufficient use of the lips, and improper use of the tongue.

B. *Enunciation and articulation.* Are vowels uttered with good quality? Consonants clear-cut? Letters and syllables properly combined?

C. *Volume.* Is the volume adapted to the size of the room and the audience? Is there sufficient variety in volume? Is the volume adapted to changes in thought and emphasis?

D. *Pitch.* Is there sufficient modulation and variety of inflection? Is the pitch too high or too low?

E. *Time.* Does the speaker employ variety in speed?

F. *Quality.* Is there breathiness? Nasality? Harshness? Tonelessness? Quality is almost entirely a matter of resonance.

IV. ACTION.

A. *The speaker's attitude.*

1. What is his attitude toward himself? He should be well-poised, sure of his preparation, and neither patronizing nor timid in his manner.
2. What is his attitude toward his subject? He should be interested enough to arouse a corresponding interest in his hearers, but neither arbitrary in demanding such interest nor apologetic.
3. What is his attitude toward his audience? He should be friendly, earnest, sincere, communicative, free from

cant, anxious to cultivate their interest and good-will.

4. What is his attitude toward public speaking? He should not be allowed to think that public speaking requires an artificial manner, a dramatic pose, fine phrases, a sonorous voice, etc. In other words, conversational quality should be his objective.

B. *Posture.* Is he free, relaxed, controlled? Is his weight well-balanced? Is his position a well-coördinated one, alert, well-poised, easy?

C. *Movement.* Is there variety of action? Is there too much or too little action? The action should suit the words and should assist the speaker in conveying meaning.

D. *Gesture.* Gestures should be an integral part of the speech, not added as an afterthought. They should be a part of coördinated body movement, and should convey an impression of strength and grace.

E. *Facial expression.* The speaker's face should express his feelings. It should be the first to convey his emotional state. His eyes should help him to communicate with his audience. In Interpretative Reading or Acting he should not keep his eyes immovably fixed upon the person to whom he is, or is supposed to be, talking.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL SPEECH CASES

SARA M. STINCHFIELD
Mt. Holyoke College

MOST of the colleges have made adequate provision for the physical welfare of their students. The high schools have their gymnasiums, and the grade schools their play-grounds, play hours, medical inspectors, dentists, nurses, dietitians; but scarcely any provision has been made for the psychic disturbances and personality difficulties or maladjustments which occur in rather surprising numbers in our schools.

The speech reaction is frequently an index of these personality difficulties, emotional disturbances, and lack of emotional poise. Much of this difficulty is remediable if it can be analyzed, and the

child or youth assisted in the matter of reëducation. A peculiar mental "twist," warped judgment, feelings of inferiority due to repeated failures, may be the explanation of incipient and mild behavior difficulties among college girls, particularly those of a repressive, introvert type.

It is not always possible to find the time to make a careful, detailed personality study covering a long period of time. Often there is no member of the faculty who feels sufficiently acquainted with the student to attempt the task. Usually the teacher of speech or expression is able to secure the coöperation and confidence of the students rather easily; therefore the task of analysis of various difficulties associated with ineffective speech, properly belongs to him or her.

As a basis for securing the coöperation of the student, together with a fairly detailed record of the student's reactions, the following outline for a case history, or personality study, by the questionnaire method has been found useful. When followed up by conferences, it gives opportunity for the beginning of reëducation not only in speech, but in the foundations of speech as expressed in the personality of the individual.

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

You are to answer the questions given below, by underlining the correct answer (Yes: No.), or by writing in the appropriate answer, where yes and no are not indicated. Thus, if the question were "Do you like to go to school?" (Yes. No.) you would underline the answer which is correct in your case.

Name_____ Home address_____
Age_____ Local address_____
FAMILY. Father's name_____ Mother's name_____ Brothers and sisters. Names and ages _____
All living? Yes. No. (underline). Your weight_____lbs. Your height____ ft. ____ in. Are you hard of hearing? Yes. No. Did you ever have a nervous breakdown? Yes. No. Where did you first go to school?_____ Age when you started_____ What study did you like best?_____ What was hardest? _____ Did you behave well in school? Yes. No. Did you generally like your teachers? Yes. No. Did you like to go to school? Yes. No. Why did you leave?_____

Have you ever worked? Yes. No. At what?_____ Wages earned at last job?_____ Did you have many chums at school? Yes. No. Just one chum? Yes. No., many chums. Did you go with a "gang?" Did you go mostly by yourself? Do you have a good many friends?_____ Did you play all games as well as the average boy or girl in your crowd?_____ Do you like indoor or outdoor games best?_____ Are you fond of athletics? Yes. No. In what sports do you excel?_____ _____Are you contented with yourself, and happy most of the time?_____ Are you often sad or moody?_____Jealous? _____ Do you feel well most of the time? Yes. No. Are you indifferent to what goes on around you? Yes. No. What excites you? Suspicious? Yes. No. What things make you angry? _____ Afraid of people? Yes. No. In what way do you feel that your parents do not treat you well?_____ Have you an older brother or sister who tries to "boss" you? Yes. No. Have you a chum who domineers over you? Yes. No. Have you ever had a severe fright? Yes. No. Do you think it affected your speech? Yes. No. Do your parents think so? Yes. No. Do you have headaches often? Yes. No. Do you smoke? Yes. No. How often?_____ Do you eat between meals? Yes. No. Are you forgetful? Yes. No. Do you sleep well? Yes. No. Are you afraid of the dark? Yes. No. Were you happy when you were 14 to 18 years of age? Yes. No. Are you happy most of the time? Yes. No. Were you considered, or are you considered, a well-behaved boy (or girl?) Yes. No. Did you ever run away from home? Yes. No. For how long?_____ Did you get (or do you get) good marks in school? Yes. No. Are you right or left handed? Right. Left. Which hand did you first learn to use in school? Right. Left. Do you sleep well? Yes. No. Dream much? Yes. No. What sort of things do you dream about? _____ (Keep a record of the dreams you have. Write down and show me the written account of the next dream you have.) Do you make up your mind independently of other people? Yes. No. Are you easily influenced? Yes. No. Stubborn? Yes. No. Have you a tendency to worry much? Yes. No. Do you blame yourself or others, when things go wrong?_____ At what age did you begin to walk?_____ To talk?_____ Do you become

easily upset, or confused? Yes. No. Can you sit still without "fidgeting?" Yes. No. Do you bite your nails? Yes. No. What other poor habits have you tried to overcome?_____ Did you like your work, this past year? Yes. No. Were you discontented with your work or yourself? Yes. No. Why?_____ _____Did you ever skip a grade in school? Yes. No. Were you ever retarded a year or less in school? Ever repeat more than one grade?_____ Is your eye-sight good? Are your teeth in good condition? Yes. No. Have many fillings? Yes. No. Do you follow a regular plan for each day? Yes. No. Do you do things in happy-go-lucky fashion, or are you methodical?_____ _____How many times a week do you go to church?_____ To the theatre?_____ To the movie?_____ Dances?_____ Library? _____ Pool-room?_____ Y. M. C. A.?_____ Clubs?_____ Gymnasium?_____ Out-door athletics?_____ How much time a week do you spend reading books or papers or magazines?_____ Give a list of the books you recall having read during the past year.

What church do you attend?_____ What form of amusement or recreation do you most enjoy? (theatre, swimming, tennis, athletics, games, concerts, baseball, football, movies, pool?) Are you socially timid? Yes. No. Do you keep things mostly to yourself? Yes. No. Can you talk things over frankly with your parents at home Yes. No. What sorts of things embarrass you? _____ Have you a strong sense of curiosity? Yes. No. Are you good at mechanical things? Yes. No. Have you executive ability? Yes. No. (Do you enjoy managing, or prefer to have someone else manage affairs for you?)_____ Can you take responsibility well? Yes. No. Do you succeed when you try to manage things? Yes. No. Is it easy for you to get along with a "boss?" Yes. No. Do you always try to "excuse" your failures? Yes. No. In temperament are you emotional?_____ Indifferent? _____ Plodding?_____ Active controlled type?_____ Active uncontrolled type?_____ Is it easy to make you laugh? Yes. No. To make you angry? Yes. No. Do you change frequently from gay to sad? Yes. No. Did you ever have the habit of twitching your face, neck or shoulder muscles? Yes. No. Do you lack self-confidence? Yes. No. Have you a good appetite? Yes. No. Give a sample menu for a day (breakfast, lunch, dinner).

Underline the traits which you think apply to you: Sensitive, suggestible, stubborn, meddlesome, shy, conceited, timid, impulsive, easily angered, selfish, jealous, obedient, boastful, deliberate, ill-tempered, good-natured, contented, very affectionate, easily frightened, lacking in confidence, moody, suspicious, given to exaggeration, find it hard to be truthful, dependable, irresponsible, imaginative, practical, well-mannered, neat, respectful to your elders, deceitful, sociable, intelligent, refined, vulgar, snobbish, forgetful, persistent.

Do you like to form plans for your future?_____
Are you contented with things as they are?_____
What sort of future are you planning for yourself?_____
Are your parents planning it for you, instead?_____

SPEECH

Is it easy for you to think of things to say and do, with people that you know very well? Yes. No. Among strangers? Yes. No. Are you easily embarrassed? Yes. No. How?_____
Can you write more easily than you can talk? Yes. No. Do you feel a lack of confidence in your ability to make a good impression on people? Yes. No. Is your memory good? Yes No. Do you recall names or faces most easily? Names. Faces. Can you think things out for yourself? Yes. No. Are you dependent on either or both parents in making important decisions?_____
Do you hesitate a long time before deciding things?_____
Is your speech better in the presence of strangers? Yes. No. Worse in the presence of people best known to you? Yes. No. Did any one in your family ever have any speech difficulty?_____
What?_____ When did you first become conscious of the fact that your speech was not good?_____
What effect has it had upon your social life?_____
School work?_____ Business or other affairs?_____
What efforts have you made to overcome it?_____
Are you willing to coöperate with us, in overcoming your difficulty? Yes. No. Are you willing to be guided by us, in the matter of food habits, smoking, recreation, hours of rest, practice, etc.? Yes. No. Have you a good deal of self-control? Yes. No. Are you easily discouraged? Yes. No. Have you a good deal of imagination? Yes. No. Are you willing to help us, by helping yourself? Yes. No. Are you willing to practice *regularly* for cer-

tain parts of each day, and to report to us about it, in your conferences? Yes. No.

Write here any additional facts which you think are important.

AMATEUR THEATRICALS IN CHINA

MRS. GOODWIN PRICE GRAHAM
Washington, D. C.

IT has been said by some, and contradicted by others, that a Chinese play may last a week. I do not know from experience which is right but I do not hesitate to assert that I believe that they could go on indefinitely without any perceptible diminution in the enthusiasm of either audience or actors. Dramatic ability seems rife and I have sat through long performances of which I could not understand a word and have enjoyed them thoroughly, so expressive was the action and play of feature of the so-called "stolid" Chinese.

In a typical school performance a series of short plays is given, all written, costumed, and stage-managed by the pupils. I say "written" but, as a matter of fact all that is written is an outline of scenes and the actors improvise their own lines, much to the satisfaction of the spectators, judging by the laughter and applause which often greets their sallies.

At the school where the performance of which I am to write took place all the advanced pupils take English and they ambitiously gave a play in English. They had to write out the parts of this and learn them by heart. Many boarding-schools at home think that their girls have done well if they perform a French play creditably; no one dreams of expecting them to write it. As the play was to be given on the anniversary of the revolution which changed China into a republic all the plays given had a patriotic cast and Joan of Arc was selected as the most appropriate heroine for the English play.

Joan—a pretty girl surprisingly like the French peasant type

—was discovered sitting alone against a background of Chinese scrolls. A friend entered, condoled with her on having a headache and departed. Then three girls in white draperies with many gold stars on their flowing, angel sleeves, came in and performed a sort of dance around Joan, moving their arms up and down in a way which suggested to an irreverent westerner the Mock Turtle and the Griffin with their "Will you, won't you, will you, won't you, will you join the dance?" They then delivered messages of cheer and Joan, bidding her family farewell, went forth to save France. She came to the tent of a French general whose attendant was asleep at the door—which was evidently considered a bit of realism. Here she met the king, who seemed in the habit of strolling in to talk matters over with the general aforesaid. He accepted her homage, presented her with her fleur de lis banner and she went to raise the siege of Orleans. The battle scene was most spirited, the English in Boy Scout uniforms and the French in their own blue trousers and jackets fighting gallantly with Boy Scout guns used like pikes, to the accompaniment of much stamping, while firecrackers put off in a pail behind the scenes made a most satisfactory substitute for musketry. The English died hard but they all died whereas no persuasions on the part of the coach would induce a single Frenchman to be so much as wounded. In the next scene the king was crowned in a costume in which purple and red were so combined as to suggest that he had attired himself in a room where a cardinal and a bishop had disrobed and had put on a garment, now of the one, now of the other, just as he happened to pick them up. However, he had fur about his neck and what more does one need to lend a regal air? Joan's request to return to her family was refused and in the next scene a traitor sought the English general and offered to sell the Maid. A thousand crowns were paid over and Joan, handed over to her foes, was bound with no fewer than three trunk straps! All her family and friends came to bid her farewell. One of them, seeing the traitor skulking in the background, strode up to him and said, "You are an uneducated man!" after which fearful insult he sneaked from the stage. Joan was not put to death before the audience; instead a sweet-faced girl spoke an epilogue to the effect that Chinese girls who loved their country should be inspired by Joan's example.

The next was a Chinese play called "Save the Country!"

They may have saved the country but they certainly saved little else for the play was in Shakespeare's earlier manner, or was it his later?—anyhow, the manner so graphically described in the Bible by the verse "—early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses." Whenever the stage became so littered with bodies that one could not strut around on it, the curtains were drawn and another scene given.

It is rather sad to see how these girls, like many of the feminists at home, have shaken off old traditions without replacing them by new principles. For instance, China has nothing more beautiful to give us than her reverence for the aged, especially for one's parents. In this play a father, refusing to believe in the imminence of war with Japan and refusing to allow his son to fight for China, is killed by his son—a conception savoring of blasphemy to the Chinese mind. The girl who took the son's part triumphed gloriously over the foe, attired in a bright blue uniform with much gold lace about it. One difficulty in regard to amateur plays does not exist in China; girls and men dress so much alike that it is not embarrassing for either to assume a different sex. When the gallant hero had returned from war, he went to kotow to his father's statue. His fiancee presented herself there at the same time and accused him of intending to kill himself. He admitted it, showing a pistol carelessly held in his left hand. She swore that she would not survive him and showed him that she, too, had a pistol. They then agreed to shoot each other. Nervousness was not unnatural; but surely it was asking a good deal of the long arm of coincidence to have each of them shoot past the other and kill a Japanese spy, lurking conveniently in the offing! However, that is what happened and the lovers, deciding that the father's spirit must have been appeased by such an offering, joined hands and bowed to the audience quite like a Broadway success, where a "happy ending" is sometimes snatched from the jaws of defeat by almost as narrow a margin.

After the tragedy, in true vaudeville style, a roaring farce was put on. Five small girls clad in the colors of the Chinese flag with tall, pointed caps on their heads represented a school class and tried to reply to the teacher's questions in the dialects of the provinces represented. A grotesque creature supposed to be a Japanese was visiting the school and awakened hearty laughter by

everything he said or did. It is curious to see how the tradition persists that the unfamiliar is ridiculous and how childishly an audience is satisfied with a caricature which has as much resemblance to the original as a child's drawing of "teachers" on a slate. The stage Englishman, the stage Irishman, the stage German, the stage Frenchman—we laugh and say the characterization is excellent; but when we see a stage American in London or Paris or Berlin, we are amazed that anyone should be so ignorant as to think we look and talk like that!

Throughout the performance the byplay kept up by the minor characters was specially noticeable. Anyone who has ever tried to stage amateur performances knows how difficult it is to keep people from becoming hopelessly stiff when they have to be on the stage with nothing to say. The Chinese seem easy and not self-conscious. One went away from this simple, school-girl entertainment, feeling that the day is not far distant when the stage will receive a new impetus from this oldest of the family of nations.

EDITORIAL

OUR HIGH SCHOOL CONSTITUENCY

IN this issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL considerably more space than usual has been devoted to the interests of high school teachers. It is in the high school, after all, that the larger educational problems of the present and future must be met, including those in speech education. If the problems of the high school have received relatively little attention in the conventions and in the JOURNAL it is because the high schools have come somewhat later into the field and have had relatively little time to get together and to arrive at even an approximate community of interests. But times are changing; and the Editor finds himself in possession of an increasingly large and increasingly interesting group of contributions, on high school topics. The opportunity is at hand, perhaps for the first time, to make the JOURNAL as valuable to the teacher in the high school as it has long been to the teacher in the college or the university.

According to the testimony of Brother Woolbert, there are among our more serious minded university professors some who would exclude from our scholarly pages all matters academically sub-freshman. They are wrong. They are wrong on several counts. The most obvious and least important is that morally, politically, and economically, the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION needs the membership and coöperation of the high school people. A much more important one is that the college teacher needs the *educational* coöperation of the high school teacher; for although the high school might conceivably ignore the college on the ground that only a small minority of its graduates go to college anyhow, the college cannot ignore the high school and the private secondary school, because from them it draws *all* its students. And the most important count of all is that in point of sincerity, thoroughness

and scholarship, and attention to the fundamental problems of speech education, the work of the high school teachers is worthy of consideration on its own merits. They may have been later in the field, and their work may still be scattered and uneven, but some of them are treading so close upon our collegiate heels that we are in much danger of losing our rubbers.

There has been no attempt, however, to make this issue exclusively a high school issue; other matters have by no means been excluded, and in the selection of articles on high school topics an effort has been made to choose those which had interest—the interest of comparison at least—for college and university teachers. Nor will there be any attempt to exclude high school topics from other issues. It is the Editor's hope to make every issue interesting to everybody—*Sic itur ad astra!*—and to make use of special emphasis from time to time, not to upset the balance, but to restore it.

ETHEREAL ELOQUENCE

THE inconceivable has happened! Who, especially among teachers of Public Speaking, could ever have imagined that an intercollegiate debate would move a listener to burst into poetry? Such, however, has occurred. Fact! Here is the poem—not a very good poem, to be sure, but indicative of certain phenomena not uninteresting to our profession:

Debates in the past on the local broadcast
  Rare — very rare — have they been;
So I cannot help state of your fine debate
  That my tapped oatmeal box tuned it in.

A taste I have had, and I would be glad
  To sit at another such treat;
For my mind, too, gets ill when deprived of its fill,
  So cater some more, I entreat!

Radio did it, of course—what else could? The poem came in as "radio applause," together with a host of other letters and postcards, in appreciation of the broadcasting by Station WIP, Gimbel Brothers, of the debate between Yale and Pennsylvania on January 19, 1924.

It has been the Editor's privilege to peruse these letters, and they have given him food for thought concerning the possibilities of radio in our field of endeavor.

Naturally the quantitative side of it strikes one first. There is no means of knowing exactly how many people heard this particular debate, but if we were to estimate that fifty thousand heard some part of it and ten thousand really listened to it we would, in the opinion of experienced broadcasters, be well within the truth. It is hardly necessary to say that no Pennsylvania team ever before had such an audience. Most of those who really listened to the debate were in Philadelphia or nearby, of course; distant listeners are apt to be too restless to do more than find out what it is all about and then tune in something else. The most distant listeners who expressed appreciation of the debate as a whole were in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. An astonishing number of appreciative letters came from Trenton, N. J.; either reception is unusually good there, or the town has a passion for debates. Others came from Chester, Wilmington, Allentown, Atlantic City, and New York. But not the least significant appreciation was that of the student body at home; the announcement that the debate was to be broadcast brought out the largest actual attendance of the season.

More interesting, perhaps, than the question of numbers, is the fact that most of the letters of appreciation came, not from interested alumni, or high school debate teams, or political intelligentsia—though there were some from all these—but from relatively uneducated people who had never heard a debate before, and who expressed the keenest appreciation of an opportunity to hear public questions discussed in clear, intelligent, and gentlemanly manner. One illiterate person struggled through four pages of incoherent English in the effort to express his admiration of the gentlemanly spirit in which the debate was conducted; and one ardent patriot expressed herself as "inspired by the realization that there are men with ideals in our own dearly beloved America."

To those of us who are teaching debate, or public speaking, or dramatics, or speech improvement, all this spells opportunity. There is hardly anything we teach that cannot, and may not soon, be broadcast. There is hardly anything that will not call for a modification of technique, or the development of a new technique, to fit the conditions of radio. Already there is a new technique in

play writing—and a new name for it: "radario" writing. Already there is a new emphasis on articulation. We have been teaching that action is even more important than utterance in public speaking; but on the radio the action is unseen, and many otherwise good speeches—especially those of deliberate speakers—fall flat. Have we who teach public speaking begun to realize this? Have we begun to meet the problem?

The Editor talked with members of the profession at the Cincinnati convention who seemed hardly aware of the existence of radio. Yet already more than half of the important speeches being delivered in this country are being broadcast, and are being heard by more invisible listeners than visible. It has been the Editor's privilege to hear plainly in his own home the voices of two Presidents of the United States; of an ex-Premier of Great Britain; of a half dozen Cabinet members, three Ambassadors, and a score of Senators and Representatives. He has heard entire speeches in Washington, New York, Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, Louisville, Montreal, and Havana, and in many lesser places. He has heard plays in Boston, New York, Pittsburgh, Schenectady, Cincinnati, and Oakland, California. He has heard lectures on art, drama, and music. He has heard teachers of literature lecture and read poetry to unseen hosts of listeners. He has heard teachers of physics, chemistry, and engineering discourse on popular phases of their subjects. He has heard teachers of history and economics discuss current problems in the political world; and he has heard teachers of music interpret the literature of their art. He has heard hardened professional speakers make mention of the difficulty of speaking into a microphone, and he has heard professional radio announcers—young men, for the most part, who were navy operators during the war—describe some of the problems of nerve control, of articulation and modulation and inflection involved in radio speaking; but he has yet to hear a teacher of public speaking discuss such problems either on or off the radio!

The thing comes nearer to us than to almost any other group of people. Are we going to be the last to realize the possibilities?

COLLEGE ENTRANCE CREDIT

FOR several years the Committee on College Entrance Credit of the National Association, under the able chairmanship of Mr. J. Walter Reeves, has labored to produce something tangible in the way of results. Something tangible now seems to be at least in sight, provided the members of the ASSOCIATION will give to the Committee the sort of support it has more than earned. The Cincinnati Convention, on motion of Mr. Reeves, ordered the appointment of a Sub-Committee on Syllabus of the Committee on Secondary Schools. The purpose of this sub-committee is the formation of a syllabus outlining the sort of instruction in secondary schools for which the ASSOCIATION will be willing to ask college entrance credit. With such a syllabus in hand the Committee will be immeasureably strengthened. It will be able to say to the colleges: "Here is what we mean by worthy secondary school instruction in speech subjects. We ask entrance credit for those schools which live up to this syllabus. And we do not ask credit for those schools which do not live up to it. You have asked us to show you our standard. This is our standard."

President Kay has appointed A. M. Drummond, of Cornell University, chairman of the Sub-Committee on Syllabus. Mr. Drummond urges that all members of the ASSOCIATION and all other interested persons send to him at the earliest possible moment "copies of state, city, and teachers' course syllabi, notices of significant articles, and their own ideas of effective approach to this problem." High school teachers especially should welcome this opportunity to render aid where aid is due in a cause that is primarily their own.

OUR DEPARTMENTS

ATTENTION is called to our departments, "New Books," and "In the Periodicals," both under the general supervision of Mr. Hudson. Mr. Gray continues to cover the Educational Publications, and Mr. Wichelns has undertaken to have the members of his Research Committee "comb" the popular magazines and miscellaneous periodicals. The Research Committee will also publish special reports on progress in research under the department of "LABORATORY AND RESEARCH." Despite all this organiza-

tion the field is so vast that some things are sure to escape us unless all our readers make a practice of acting as "scouts;" and Mr. Hudson, Mr. Gray, and Mr. Wichelns will welcome all leads and suggestions.

Our department of "NEWS AND NOTES" is similarly a cooperative enterprise, and Miss Rousseau, its editor, will be glad to receive items of general interest.

The Editor is sorely in need of two numbers of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL to complete his files. The missing numbers are Volume I, Number 1, April, 1915, and Volume V, Number 3, May, 1919. For either of these numbers he will gladly pay one dollar.

THE FORUM

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Letters for the Forum should be direct and concise. They may be upon any topic in Speech Education, controversial or otherwise; but publication is not to be regarded as editorial endorsement, either as to form or content.]

A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

To the Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—When I opened the November JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION and saw my name signed to a review of Afred Dwight Sheffield's *Joining in Public Discussion,* I suffered a severe shock. This was not merely because I have never intended to be, like Autolycus, 'a snapper-up of unconsidered trifles' nor because the reviewer's opinion of the book is quite the reverse of that which I expressed in the JOURNAL two years ago and still hold, but most of all that I should seem so unappreciative of the text-book which for my particular purposes I have found more inspiring and more practical than any other in twenty years of teaching.

The writer's contention that the average trade-union worker would be put off by the psychological terms used in the book is perfectly true; but would the average trade-union worker—any more than the average broker or doctor or T. B. M.—be interested in a book on group discussion? Those workers likely to use the book would be the small percentage—pitifully small in any walk of life—who really enjoy using their brains. And those would be quite likely to know the vocabulary of a subject so generally discussed among thinking people as the modern applied psychology. Certainly the members of the trades union college where this book was first tried out seemed to me able to grasp these terms—even to use them with ease and effectiveness. The college classes in which I have used the book, find no difficulty with a terminology which among undergraduates today is "human nature's daily food."

The reviewer's criticism as to the amount of time given to a detailed study of the syllogism may well be valid; in so short a

treatise of a big subject the right proportion is not easy to find. I can think of two possible reasons for this seeming excess. The first of these is that Mr. Sheffield's purpose is the furthest extreme from that of producing "easy speakers," "silver-tongued orators." To teach people to coöperate in the quest for truth or for a wiser policy requires so new and difficult a technique that Mr. Sheffield has perhaps overstressed the fact that a careful analysis and development of one's own thinking processes are even more important as a foundation than a beautiful voice or a ready command of gesture, or even a good vocabulary.

Another cause of this insistence may be the fact that while the book was taking shape in Mr. Sheffield's mind he was teaching in a women's college, and it is common knowledge that girls need more training even than boys in avoiding the tendency to skip steps in their logical processes and jump to conclusions.

As to the criticism that a disproportionate amount of space is given to parliamentary procedure—here again one should take into consideration the purpose of the book, to develop the power of men and women to free themselves from the fight image and the domination of the ego, and to work together for the furtherance of knowledge and the betterment of the race. Moreover workmen, like women, have not had the benefit of a long tradition and practice in parliamentary usage and would therefore I think find this discussion particularly useful. It has been one of the features of the book that my students have found most stimulating and helpful.

The misunderstanding which led to my name being signed to the article in question was one of the sort that seem incredible and yet happen through no one's fault. Will you please publish this letter in THE JOURNAL, as evidence to the writer of the review that I was not intentionally the thief of his thunder?

Very truly yours,

ELIZABETH AVERY
Smith College

(Both the former Editor and the present Editor wish to express their regret for the error which attributed to Miss Avery a book review written by Miss Lousene G. Rousseau, Western State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Michigan).

FOOT NOTES ON FORM AND CONTENT

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—For the sake of an accurate record on what still seems to me to be a subject deserving of both careful thought and some approach to precision in the use of language, I reluctantly submit to the readers of THE QUARTERLY another comment on form and content in teaching public speaking. I wish to refer briefly to certain passages in the November, 1923, issue of THE QUARTERLY in which my name was mentioned in connection with certain statements in regard to this subject.

Dr. Wichelns (on p. 319) said: "But I do not agree with Mr. O'Neill's attempt to separate the ultimate purpose of education sharply from the immediate and prime objective of a group of courses such as given by any one department." I made no such attempt. On the contrary, in the paragraph to which Dr. Wichelns refers, (bottom of p. 29 of the February, 1923 QUARTERLY) instead of making a separation between the purpose of education and the objective of a department, I was making a distinction between the immediate purpose of a course in social science and the immediate purpose of a course in public speaking. And I remarked in parenthesis: "(Of course, we are not concerned here [i. e. when we are differentiating between the immediate purpose of a course in tariff and the immediate purpose of a course in public speaking] with the ultimate purpose which is the same for all courses, the purpose of education itself . . .)." In other words my position is, and was, that the ultimate purpose of a course in public speaking is identical with the ultimate objective of education. It seems to me obvious enough that the fact that the ultimate objective of a course in economics is identical with the ultimate objective of a course in public speaking, is in no way inconsistent with the fact that their immediate objectives are quite different. In regard to our courses fitting the ultimate objective of education, Dr. Wichelns' article contains an admirable statement of what has been consistently my theory and practice ever since I became a college teacher. I should like to take time to endorse and discuss with hearty approval a great many of its points; but now I must take only the time and the space to correct such reports as this one, that I attempted to separate sharply two objectives which I believed, and said, are identical.

In the same article (on p. 322) Dr. Wichelns has this sentence: "It is the specialists as represented in Mr. O'Neill's paper (already referred to) who make the separation [between form and content] absolute, who speak of teaching how, as if the how were really separable from the what." This reference is undocumented, so I have no clue to the sentence or paragraph in which I am supposed to have made absolute the separation between form and content. If anyone will point out to me such a passage that I have ever written, either in the article that Professor Wichelns was discussing or elsewhere, I shall retract and apologize for having published such nonsense. But no such passage will be found. It does not exist. I doubt if such a passage exists anywhere in serious writing. I do not understand how anyone can believe that such a separation can be made absolute. The very expression itself is nonsense. Try to imagine any absolute separation between architecture and building material, between cooking and food, between singing and songs, between acting and plays, between rhetoric and ideas, between speaking and that which is spoken. Nonsense is indeed a good enough word. I trust that the readers of THE QUARTERLY will not believe without some proof that I am either the father of, or the attorney for, such nonsense.

Another statement of the same idea is found on page 323: "For those who start from the concept of the unity of the human spirit, no enduring separation of method and content is possible." Quite so. How could such a separation be possible? As a matter of fact no enduring separation of method and content is possible even for those who start from so meager a base as a knowledge of the meaning of the words "method" and "content."

But if the separation cannot be absolute and enduring, does it follow that there can be no separation between form and content? Are we incapable of distinguishing between them because we cannot go so far as an absolute and enduring separation? Dr. Wichelns makes "the specialists as represented in Mr. O'Neill's paper . . . speak of teaching how, as if the how were really separable from the what." Isn't it separable, obviously separable? If the how is not really separable from the what, how can there ever be any real criticism of the *work* of a symphony orchestra, an opera company, a singer, an architect, an actor, an advocate, a carpenter, or a cook? What becomes of Winans' oft quoted engineer,

who said that more engineers failed because they did not know how to present their good plans than for any other one cause? He would be puzzled by the thesis that "the how" is not separable from "the what." Rhetoric from Korax down has been a consideration of *how*, a study of form, a technique. The scholars of twenty-two centuries have believed that the how is really separable from the what. And among the scholars who have worked in the field of rhetoric in this belief, have been leaders of thought in many of the periods and in many of the countries from which we draw the best of our cultural heritage. I should be interested in an hypothesis that would explain this universal error.

"They ('the technicians and specialists')," continues Professor Wichelns (on p. 323), "ought, with the sophists of old, to be willing to teach students to speak well on nonsensical or frivolous subjects and to speak well on both sides of the same proposition. Method is method, and ought to be applicable to any subject matter. This is the logical outcome of an insistence on method as separate from content, which comes from the pragmatic view of human nature." Let us see if all this follows. There are in fact two quite different principles involved here. The first is that those who believe that method is separable from content must logically believe that with a good method a good speech can be made without good material or content. Does this follow? Of course not. And it does not follow because the statement that method is separable from content happens not to be the whole of rhetoric, or the whole of the professional creed of the teachers of rhetoric. They believe (always have believed, that is the good ones always have) that a good method and a good content, while clearly separable, are both requisite to a good speech.

It should always be borne in mind, in this connection, that in this separation of method and content, the rhetorician is not taking an attitude that is different from that taken in all other arts or crafts. In fact any art or craft is unthinkable if method is not separable from content. If you believe that acting is a separable thing from dramatic literature, does it follow that you must believe that with good acting a good play is not needed? I trust not. If you believe that cooking is separable from being in possession of the ingredients, that making good bread is a separable, a different thing from having flour and yeast in your keeping, does it follow

logically that you believe that good bread can be made from sand or sawdust? Feeble logic, if I may be pardoned a judgment.

The second principle involved in the above reference to the sophists is that those who believe that method is separable from content must believe that it is possible (and justifiable) to teach students to speak well on both sides of a proposition. This is very different from the first principle that I have just discussed. Teaching students to speak well on both sides of a proposition that really has two sides with an adequate "content" on each of them, is a very different thing from teaching them (or trying to teach them) to speak well on subjects which have no adequate content at all. This latter is covered by the discussion of the first principle above. It may be called sophistry, but it is not a necessary concomittant to a belief that method is separable from content. But this second principle, when applied to the sort of propositions that I have indicated, is not sophistry at all, but undiluted Aristotelian rhetoric. Any student who is rhetorically able to speak well on one side of the big questions on which honest and able statesmen and publicists differ, is, *ipso facto,* able to speak well on the other side. The truth of this statement is not diminished by the well recognized fact that any speaker *may* (and in certain types of situations probably *always will*) speak better if he has, in addition to the preparation that will enable him to speak well on either side of the proposition, a fervent conviction on the side he is speaking for. Whether or not a man will in a given case advocate the side of a proposition in which he does not believe, is a problem in ethics and not in rhetoric. So far as I know, no student of rhetoric has ever effectively challenged Aristotle's position on this, which he expresses more than once in his *Rhetoric,* and which is perhaps best put in his statement (in I, i, 14): "For the essence of Sophistry is not in the faculty but in the moral purpose."

I trust that I shall not be interpreted to have said that rhetoric is more important than ethics, or that if a man have rhetorical ability he has no need of a sense of moral values. That is not the point. The point is that a man may have rhetorical ability and be either an honest man or a crook, that a man may be an honest man and either have or lack rhetorical ability (Cicero's dicta which are capable of a somewhat opposite interpretation, to the contrary notwithstanding).

In the second article in the November, 1923 issue of THE QUARTERLY, Professor Sandford shifts the discussion from *"instruction in speech content"* to *"supervision of speech content,"* and asks in his opening paragraph (p. 324): "Just what are the essential points of difference between those who favor some sort of systematic attention to subject matter and those who do not?" I confess that I should like to know what these points are if they are ever discovered; but I doubt if they ever will be, because I doubt the existence (in the field of original public speaking, rhetoric, speech composition—the field which Professors Hunt, Sandford, and I were all discussing in our first articles) of anyone who does not favor some sort of systematic attention to subject matter. I have never known of such a person. Of course Mr. Sandford does not, and cannot, point out or quote any passage in which I have ever taken such a position. In fact I cannot conceive how argumentation, debate, or speech composition, can be taught at all, either poorly or well, by a teacher who does not pay some sort of systematic attention to subject matter.

On the same page Professor Sandford states (also without documentation): "Specifically, he (Professor O'Neill) asserts . . . that there is no need for supervision of speech content." I nowhere asserted this, specifically or otherwise, as anyone can see who will take the trouble to read the article (in the February, 1923 QUARTERLY) which Professor Sandford was discussing.

Again (on p. 327) Mr. Sandford writes: "Stripped of this extraneous matter, the issue remains, 'Is supervision of speech content desirable?' " He cannot come to issue with me on this question unless he wishes to take the negative. I shall insist on remaining where I have always been, both in theory and in practice, in my teaching and in my professional writing, emphatically on the affirmative.

Professor Sandford continues, immediately after the above quotation: "Professor O'Neill asserts that it is not, at least he says that as an objective for a public speaking course, what a student knows about his topic *(sic)* is 'none of the business of the instructor in public speaking.' " And then he accuses me of "hedging" the above by a statement which he quotes from a point *eight pages farther back* in my article! The truth is that I neither made the statement nor "hedged" in regard to it, as anyone can see who

will refer to page 47 of my original article. The phrase "none of the business of the instructor in public speaking" which I used in regard to the students' knowledge of the social sciences (remarking that this happens to be the particular business of the teachers in another department) Mr. Sandford has chosen to quote me as having used in regard to a subject which I did not so much as mention in connection with it.

My lack of "fairness" in not having sent "at least a letter of inquiry as to" Professor Sandford's views (after having read his article setting them forth), is explained by the fact that I took it for granted that his article contained them. It was the ideas in that article that I was interested in and was discussing, not Mr. Sandford, nor Mr. Sandford's views *per se*. I could not presume to investigate so delicate a problem as whether or not he really believed what he wrote. I could in courtesy only assume this to be the case.

Finally, there is in this second article by Mr. Sandford, as there was in the first, and as there was in certain papers at the Cincinnati convention, a confusion of "form" with "delivery" and of "content" with "composition." Mr. Sandford quotes Professor Ketcham as expressing his attitude as follows: "Public speaking is primarily a constructive thinking process, not merely a sound making operation. We are of course interested in matters of delivery, such as voice development and action." Surely delivery is no more "form" or "technique" than is composition. When we are teaching students *how to do* anything we are teaching form or technique (the *how* as distinguished from the *what*). This is elementary and indisputable. Professor Ketcham's quotation continues as follows: "We are primarily interested in developing the capacity of the student to analyze speaking problems, sift the essential from the trivial, and exercise judgment in weighing facts and ideas with regard to the probable effect on the hearer." There ends the quotation which expresses the approved attitude. *And this is all pure form, undiluted technique!* There is no trace of "instruction in speech content" (which Professor Sandford has said "is necessary") in this statement. Any teacher of public speaking who believes that the above quotation from Professor Ketcham states the proper objectives of a course in public speaking, must necessarily disagree with Professor Hunt's statements

(1) "The problem of content should be recognized and dealt with as an integral part of instruction in public speaking." (June 1922 QUARTERLY, p. 256), and (2) "The addition of substance to form as an integral part of instruction is necessary for the best development of the speaker." (Ibid, p. 265); and he must also disagree with Professor Sandford's statement (1) "Instruction in speech content is necessary" (November 1922, QUARTERLY, p. 371) and his recommendations in regard to the teachers (2) "if instruction in content is to be given a place in public speaking." (Op. cit.)

It was to this original position that the instructor in public speaking should furnish instruction in the subject matter of the students' speeches, that I objected, and it is to this position that I still object. Of course I do not now object, and never have objected to "supervision" of subject matter, nor to "paying some sort of attention to" subject matter. I still believe that this is a very serious problem, one that should be given the most careful thought, and the fullest and frankest possible discussion. But unless we are willing to keep to the original thesis, and to the exact language of the documents in which it was promulgated, the discussion is not likely to be fruitful of much good.

Yours very truly,
JAMES M. O'NEILL,
University of Wisconsin

AN OPPORTUNITY

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—During the past year it has been my job, as Assistant Editor of THE QUARTERLY, to browse around the library on the hunt for articles in the general educational publications that might be of interest to teachers of speech. It will be my duty to do the same thing for the coming year. The April and June issues contain the results of one year's work, with the exception of a few articles that will be mentioned in the forthcoming number.

In my work in this capacity one thing has struck me as significant, and that is the scarcity of work that has been done by teachers of speech. While all the articles listed and reviewed have been of general or direct interest to readers of THE QUARTERLY, most of

them have been written by investigators who are primarily interested in other fields. Of course it would be better to have it done by them than not done at all, and the work they are doing is valuable. We can use all that they will give us. But it is my point that since this is the primary interest of teachers of speech, there is a place in the general educational publications for the results of our research.

As a rule educators are ignorant of the fact that we are concerned at all with research. Not so long ago a communication came into my hands, consisting of an inquiry concerning the extent of the "corrective speech" work that is being done in the schools of our own state, Illinois. The reply referred the inquirer to a "better speech" plan that had been worked out some years ago by the teachers of English. The recipient of the original query did not even know that there was a difference between "better speech" and "corrective speech."

Teachers of mathematics, English, history, and other fields enter the educational publications with articles which are of value to other teachers. The result is that those subjects are known; they are beyond the stage when propaganda is necessary. It is not a question any longer as to *whether*, but *how*, they shall be taught. To us it seems that speech is in the same category; but there are any number of educators who do not accept that dictum. They go back to the days when "public speaking" consisted of the declamation contest and the highly artificial debate, and on that ground they condemn, not without reason, the whole procedure, quite unaware of the fact that teaching of speech now is, or ought to be, an entirely different thing.

One reason for this is that teachers of speech have too long neglected the opportunity to write for the educational publications. Of the obstacles to the greatest advancement of the work of speech, it is perhaps the easiest to overcome. There are many of our number who are engaged in research of a quality that will hold its own with that of any other field. We are doing it not as psychologists, nor as educators, nor as physiologists, but solely and primarily as teachers of *speech*. What is to prevent this work from going out into the general educational field? If the teaching of mathematics is of interest, why is not the teaching of speech?

It is my belief that there is a great opportunity for us in this

work. Our purposes may be varied; but call it propaganda, call it a process of education—certainly there are many educators who need educating; call it what you will, the need is there, and that need can be met only by teachers and investigators whose primary interest is speech.

Very truly yours,
GILES WILKESON GRAY
University of Illinois

EVERYBODY'S DOING IT

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION:

Dear Sir—Noting the quotation from my writings in Mr. Caplan's article in the February issue of your valued JOURNAL (pp. 44, 45), I write to inquire if you would consider for publication an article by me on the subject of "Form and Content"?

Very respectfully yours,
G. PETRONIUS

(By all means send it in. Copy for the June issue closes April fifteenth. Ed.)

ASSOCIATION NEWS

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

President Kay, of the National Association, announces the following chairmen of committees:

Of the Committee on Speech in Normal Schools and Teachers' Colleges, Miss Lousene G. Rousseau, Western State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Of the Research Committee, Herbert A. Wichelns, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Of the Committee on College Entrance Credit, J. Walter Reeves, Peddie Institute, Hightstown, N. J.

Of the Sub-Committee on Syllabus of the Secondary Schools Committee, A. M. Drummond, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

THE 1924 CONVENTION

President Kay has received from Director Ralph Dennis of the School of Speech of Northwestern University an official invitation on behalf of the University to hold the meetings of the 1924 Convention on the campus, and to make Evanston the headquarters instead of The Loop.

The President will welcome expressions of opinion from all who hope to be present as to the advisability of this move.

Evanston joins Chicago on the north. It may be reached by train in twenty to thirty minutes; by elevated in forty to fifty. The fare is ten or fifteen cents. Evanston is a beautiful city of about twenty-five thousand inhabitants. Annie May Swift Hall, which is offered as a meeting place, contains a well-equipped little theatre and numerous halls and class-rooms for the use of committees and sectional meetings. Near by are fine dormitories for men and women at which all can be accommodated with comfortable rooms at nominal charge. There are also several fine hotels and restaurants for those who prefer them.

Whatever the decision, arrangements must be made a long time in advance, and members are therefore urged to give President Kay an expression of opinion *at once*. He will act as the majority seem to prefer.

EASTERN AND NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCES

As previously announced, the Eastern Public Speaking Conference and the New England Public Speaking Conference will hold a joint convention at Harvard University on Friday and Saturday, April 11 and 12. Wide diversity in the matter of spring vacations made it impossible to find dates satisfactory to everybody; these dates were fixed upon as the only possible compromise.

President Hunt and President Huntington are not yet ready to announce a program in detail. Conferences will be devoted to dramatic art and "workshop" methods; the teaching of argumentation; recent experiments in intercollegiate debating; rhetoric and oratory; historical and critical estimates of effectiveness in public address; problems of normal schools in speech training, public speaking, and dramatics; and speech tests and measurements. Copies of the completed program will be mailed to all members of both conferences, and to all others who will send their names to E. B. Huntington, Brown University, Providence, R. I., or to E. L. Hunt, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

The meetings of the Conference will be held at Harvard University, and headquarters will be at the Parker House, convenient to Harvard Yard.

NEW BOOKS

The Speaking of English Verse. By ELSIE FOGERTY. (Principal of the Central School of Speech Training and Dramatitc Art, London). E. P. Dutton & Co., N. Y., 1923.

To each one of us, "a forlorn and lonely inmate of the doubtful castle" of the body, is given the power to pass out over a bridge of words, or at least to exchange from afar "despairing friendly signals." In an age when training by means of the cinema is almost entirely visual, with no thought at the level of speech, for too many the bridge is frail, the signals vague and sure of misinterpretation.

Mr. Drinkwater has said that spiritual lethargy is the greatest social evil, and that what we must most desire is a continuity of vivid experience, that we may be awakened to "the beauty and the heroic conflict of life," to "the innumerable adventures that are in every wind and bough and footstep," and to the ugliness of injustice and evil wheresoever they prevail as the direct result of spiritual lethargy. Tracing the connection between art and conduct, he finds that contact with fine art—and above all, with poetry, which is contact with pregnant and living words—will most surely destroy this lethargy.

Marking the dawn of a revival in Diction as an expressive art, of supreme value also in the forming of a sure literary taste, this book is of great value to teachers. "Diction," says Miss Fogerty, "is the speech which results when after following the poet as truly as we can through his own path in the making of a poem, after thinking in pictures, and thinking in form, we think in words: feeling their musical signficance, charged with association, tenderness and beauty, and when by our own gift of utterance we waken response to all this in our hearers."

Utterance consists of audible movement and is therefore subject to all the laws of rhythmic movement. The author removes

the popular misconception of the nature of rhythm, when it is confused with time and metre, whereas it is the fundamental law of movement, as gravitation is the fundamental law of stability. Every movement must take place through a certain space, during a certain time, and with a certain degree of force. When space, time, and force are accurately measured under the direction of a definite intention, the result is a rhythmic movement. The foundation of all Expressive Art is Thought in Action.

"Now when we speak of intentional movement or of rhythmic movement as requiring intention, we do not necessarily mean we are thinking about, and voluntarily performing, that special movement—quite the contrary; we mean that particular movement is fulfilling to perfection its part in carrying out the whole action we wish to accomplish; and to do this, we must have a body flexible and alert to our will—often, indeed, we must have a body trained to the most extraordinary submission to our will. The great orator is not considering how he is to move his lips and tongue in order to articulate—they obey him, and carry out his intention by long practice or natural aptitude, but the stammerer thinks of nothing else but those very movements which should be unconscious, and so destroying his own intention, becomes unrhythmic and finally uncoördinated." Hence the need for arduous technical training in all the movements which go to make up speech, and for intelligent and scientific practice, infinitely far removed from the dread days when something called "elocution" held sway, "never . . . interpreting anything but the worst, the most vulgar and meaningless of verse, because in that it could find room for the personal self-assertion which destroyed all true faculty of poetic interpretation."

All children should be trained in "clear and musical speech, intelligent diction, and the understanding of poetic form," and every teacher "should be a speaker of pure and beautiful English, and every teacher of English should be able to read and speak verse and have a love of poetry." But above all, "Poetry is an end in itself; it should never be used as a vehicle for teaching other things. . . . We have all heard of the child who said, 'Oh, I could understand it so well if only she wouldn't explain it.' . . . Natural love and appreciation can be a sufficient substitute for adult understanding in all imaginative art."

The fundamental importance of Speech Training—including Voice Training and Phonetics; the speaking of verse; prosody and the history of verse patterns and poetic form; literary appreciation,—are all presented and discussed in this extraordinarily able book, the result of many years of practical experience and research in all branches of the work—artistic, technical, remedial.

Through the spread of such doctrine there is great hope that children may come into their heritage of what Mr. W. W. Gibson calls "all the manifold delights a little net of words may hold."

DOROTHIE F. PANTHING, *Smith College.*

Platform Speaking. By GEORGE ROWLAND COLLINS. Harper and Brothers, N. Y., 1923. Pp. x & 341.

"This text-book is intended to furnish a practical guide to effective platform speaking for the business and professional man, whether he be a college student training for his career, or an established man-of-affairs studying for self-improvement." This special group, Professor Collins says, "does not need to know and understand all the intricacies of voice production. . . . *What* he says will count almost as much, if not more than, *how* he says it. He needs to know something about speech-composition, about the analysis and synthesis of speech-material. His task is not primarily a graceful and artful exhibition; it is effective persuasion."

Perhaps the title of the book is so strongly suggestive of the lyceum and lecture platform that the author feels called upon to make this explanation and to assume as the task of his particular readers what is generally considered the business of most speakers on almost all occasions.

In the light of this statement in the preface, it is natural that we should find the most satisfactory portion of this text under the heading, "Speech-Construction." These six chapters—on the analysis of purpose, the analysis of subject-matter, the analysis of the audience, the arrangement and development of the speech-material, the introduction and conclusion, and style—offer a detailed treatment of the problems involved which makes them of much practical value. The analysis of subject-matter is particularly clear and is made more useful by the inclusion of several definite plans or formulas for the guidance of the speaker in his preparation. Occasionally there is a slight falling short of the mark, as where the purpose of the introduction is, quite correctly,

stated as "(1) to attract favorable attention and interest and (2) to give any necessary information on the subject," and that very significant phrase "common ground" is inconspicuously tucked away in a paragraph of minor importance. To be sure, attention is secured by "(1) a startling statement or (2) a suspense-provoking statement," yet we may question whether this division is complete or sufficient for all occasions, as seems to be implied. Some of us might consider as rather pretentious the term "philosophical" when applied to the type of introduction which makes use of general or abstract propositions.

The latter half of the book is devoted to specialized speech-forms and appendices of specimens of speech-construction, speech-subjects, students' speeches, and speech-plans. The subject of delivery, having been labelled as comparatively unimportant, is dismissed in three chapters. Although it is noted that "because of this peculiar power of Voice and Action in communication, the development of ability in the manipulation of these tools is of the utmost importance," the discussion contains much vagueness and some confusion. At various places in the consideration of voice, principles of interpretation are touched upon in a manner that does not make the distinction between the subjects clear. One could suggest that a business or professional man might think the command "use every bit of air pressure in producing tone," ambiguous, and another, "the quality of tone is 'its physical make up, its resonance complexity,'" almost meaningless without a fuller explanation than is given.

Some of the exercises appended to this chapter are at best not clear. The third exercise under breathing would help to explain the previously confused matter of the open throat in breath control were not a further confusion made between the abdominal muscles and the diaphragm. The student is bound to feel that something is wrong in the sixth exercise for vocalization when he attempts to develop resonance by the use of prolonged consonant sounds among which are listed, doubtless through a printer's error, the plosives *p* and *d*. It seems possible that the exercises for nasality might do as much for the development of that vocal quality, called unnatural and distracting in a previous chapter, as for its elimination.

The chapter on Action begins and ends with admirable discussions of natural bodily action and gesture as arising from the

thought and emotional content of the speech upon the release of the speaker from unnatural restraint. Between the first and last parts are sprinkled more detailed instructions which, however practical some of them may be, tend to contradict the principles laid down. The method used in the discussion of the hand-and-arm gesture is such as to encourage mechanical application. "Use the hand vertical mainly to express decisive approval of a proposition or fact." "Use the index to compel attention, to get into closer contact with the audience, to emphatically indicate what should be listened to above all else." A suggestion for movement about the platform "at the time of a momentary lapse of thought" is sure to comfort the student given to lax preparation.

Altogether *Platform Speaking* presents a fairly adequate treatment of much good theory and practice, accompanied by a great deal of illustrative material, but weakened by some inaccurate and confusing statements.

LEE S. HULTZEN, *Cornell University.*

The Will-Temperament and its Testing. By JUNE E. DOWNEY, Professor of Psychology, University of Wyoming. World Book Company, Yonkers-on-the-Hudson, N. Y. 1923.

Human nature is and probably always will be a most interesting and valuable study. In order to give us an insight into capacities as well as a measure of achievement, mental tests and educational measurements have been devised and applied throughout our school systems, and in our industrial enterprises, and during the recent war was used in military operations. But intelligence tests are not and can never give a complete chart of the personality. One must take into account the factor of temperament, which, according to Dr. Downey, involves (1) "the amount of nervous energy at the disposal of the individual; and (2) the tendency of such nervous energy to discharge immediately into motor areas that innervate the muscles and the glands; or, on the contrary, to find a way out by a roundabout pathway of discharge." . . . "Since the organism is a unit, the output of energy and its discharge by a simplified or elaborated pathway color the personality throughout."

For a number of years Dr. Downey has been developing a series of tests designed for "determining the general level of ac-

tivity or impulsion, the degree of inhibition, and the modes in which impulsion and inhibition function in an individual." She has taken only one phase of temperament, which she has called "will-temperament," defining *will* as merely the dynamic pattern of the individual."

Dr. Downey points out the fact that since the personality is colored by temperament, one's success in his undertakings is largely affected by it. The value of these tests lies in determining to some degree the probable success which persons of different types may expect. She insists that as yet the tests are in a preliminary stage, and much work remains to be done before they can be accepted without certain reservations. But that they reveal certain tendencies to reactions, and that there are some characteristic "will-profiles" for given types of personalities ,there seems to be little doubt.

The book is readable; even more, it is interesting, and written without dogma, but rather with a caution which becomes the experimenter in a subject about which little is known at present. It points the way toward further investigation, however, and one is led to believe that herein lie possibilities for valuable research.

The chapter on "Speech and the Will-Temperament" will be of especial interest to readers of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL. Dr. Downey points out the possibility that speech disorders, instead of being purely the result of emotional disturbances, may be "the outward manifestation of temperamental and volitional traits, and that the only hope for cure which will be genuine and not merely apparent lies in insight into traits of personality." This may not be news to those who are engaged in the work of speech correction, but it offers a suggestion to students of the subject. It may be that will-temperament testing will be a regular part of the diagnosis of each case of speech defect.

In general, the book is one to be recommended to any who are interested at all in problems of personality, and in their relation to the deeper problems of life.

G. W. G., *Urbana, Ill.*

IN THE PERIODICALS

ARTICLES REVIEWED

O'NEILL, JAMES M., *Objectives in Speech Education,* Educational Review, LXVI, 5, p. 278. December, 1923.

"I mean by speech education, educational activities in which knowledge of or proficiency in the function of direct, immediate human expression or communication, by means of voice and body alone, is the primary and immediate aim. . . . First: The field of speech covers oral expression, oral composition, private speech if you like, voice science, voice training, phonetics, the correction of speech disorders (such as stammering, stuttering, lisping, and others), the psychology of speech, the pedagogy of speech. . . . Second: The field of speech covers oral reading, interpretative reading, acting, educational dramatics. . . . Third: The field of speech covers public speaking, argumentation and debate,—oratory. . . . The greatest need of the immediate present and future is an adequate supply of well-trained teachers."

PARRISH, W. M., *What is Public Speaking?* School and Society, XVIII, p. 465. November 14, 1923.

In this article Professor Parrish emphasizes training in "practical public speaking" as distinguished from the once prevalent elocutionary discipline, arguing that this training, in a public speaking department, forms "a nucleus about which are gathered courses in interpretative reading, drama, acting, debating, voice culture, speech correction and other more or less related studies." He also points out the possibilities of advanced work in public speaking, especially along the lines of rhetorical style, history of oratory, and psychology of persuasion. "There seems to be no good reason," he concludes, "why the work as here outlined, with its classical background, and its obvious present-day useful-

ness, should lack, if competently handled, in pedagogical soundness or academic respectability."

SEARSON, J. W., *Determining a Language Program,* English Journal, XIII, 2, p. 99. February, 1924.

This paper reports the results of some questionnaires designed to aid in constructing a program for the teaching of English. The teachers questioned touch topics of general nature, remote from the field of speech, except where they approach speech through emphasizing the importance of erecting a course on a "use basis." The laymen questioned, including about 7,700 of all walks of life in 42 states, emphasize the need of ability to read and to understand written matter as the first desideratum; ability to converse, to think clearly, to persuade, all seemed more important than ability to write. It appears from this extensive investigation that vocational groups, unless highly specialized, do not differ from each other in the relative importance their members attach to these various language skills.

ENGLISH JOURNAL, XIII, 1, p. 39. January, 1924. Items of interest from the minutes of the Detroit meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, held last November.

A resolution was passed favoring training in the technique of the speaking voice for every departmental teacher of English, and urging colleges to place such a course on the required list for those students who wish recommendations as teachers of English. A resolution was passed urging every teacher-certificating agency to require reasonable proficiency in the oral use of the language and to make a test in oral English part of any examination given candidates for certificates.

Professor G. N. Merry read a paper on The Speaking Voice, in which he set down as standards for the public schools: 1. Audibility of speech sounds; 2. Use of natural pitch; 3. Definiteness of mouth position for utterance of speech sounds; 4. Agreeable voice quality; 5. Most important: a highly communicative tone of voice.

Professor A. M. Drummond read a paper on Some Aspects of Dramatic Art Today; this is summarized at length on pages 89-91 of the journal in question.

ARTICLES LISTED

CATHOLIC WORLD, CVIII, 707, p. 90. February, 1924.

A specimen of Spanish official eloquence: King Alphonso's address to the pope on the occasion of the monarch's recent visit to Rome; it is not stated whether or not the address is given in full.

CAVERLY, MILLIS, *Standards in Interpretation,* Emerson Quarterly, IV, 2, p. 17. January, 1924.

DYAR, DOROTHY, *The Call of the Church to the Trained Public Speaker of Today,* Emerson Quarterly, IV, 2, p. 5. January, 1924.

WRIGHT, C. D., *High Lights on Amateur Drama Throughout the United States,* English Journal, XIII, 2, p. 125.

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

(Edited by GILES WILKESON GRAY, University of Illinois)

DANFORTH, RALPH E.: *Language as a Factor in Human Evolution;* Scientific Monthly, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, p. 76. January, 1924.

KEENER, E. E.: *Some Suggestions on the Technique of Teaching Pupils to Read;* Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. VI, No. 5, p. 177. January, 1924.

REIGHARD, JACOB: *The University Teaching of Speech Reading to the Adult Deafened;* School and Society, Vol. XIX, No. 473, p. 58. January 19, 1924.

TAIT, WILLIAM D.: *Motor Speech Functions in Dreams;* Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, p. 244. October-December, 1923.

VALENTINE, C. W.: *The Function of Images in the Appreciation of Poetry;* British Journal of Psychology, Vol. XIV, No. 2, p. 164. October, 1923.

WELLS, F. L.: *Vocal and Manual Mechanisms in Choice Reactions;* Journal of Experimental Psychology, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 59. February, 1924.

ness, should lack, if competently handled, in pedagogical soundness or academic respectability."

SEARSON, J. W., *Determining a Language Program,* English Journal, XIII, 2, p. 99. February, 1924.

This paper reports the results of some questionnaires designed to aid in constructing a program for the teaching of English. The teachers questioned touch topics of general nature, remote from the field of speech, except where they approach speech through emphasizing the importance of erecting a course on a "use basis." The laymen questioned, including about 7,700 of all walks of life in 42 states, emphasize the need of ability to read and to understand written matter as the first desideratum; ability to converse, to think clearly, to persuade, all seemed more important than ability to write. It appears from this extensive investigation that vocational groups, unless highly specialized, do not differ from each other in the relative importance their members attach to these various language skills.

ENGLISH JOURNAL, XIII, 1, p. 39. January, 1924. Items of interest from the minutes of the Detroit meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, held last November.

A resolution was passed favoring training in the technique of the speaking voice for every departmental teacher of English, and urging colleges to place such a course on the required list for those students who wish recommendations as teachers of English. A resolution was passed urging every teacher-certificating agency to require reasonable proficiency in the oral use of the language and to make a test in oral English part of any examination given candidates for certificates.

Professor G. N. Merry read a paper on The Speaking Voice, in which he set down as standards for the public schools: 1. Audibility of speech sounds; 2. Use of natural pitch; 3. Definiteness of mouth position for utterance of speech sounds; 4. Agreeable voice quality; 5. Most important: a highly communicative tone of voice.

Professor A. M. Drummond read a paper on Some Aspects of Dramatic Art Today; this is summarized at length on pages 89-91 of the journal in question.

ARTICLES LISTED

CATHOLIC WORLD, CVIII, 707, p. 90. February, 1924.

A specimen of Spanish official eloquence: King Alphonso's address to the pope on the occasion of the monarch's recent visit to Rome; it is not stated whether or not the address is given in full.

CAVERLY, MILLIS, *Standards in Interpretation,* Emerson Quarterly, IV, 2, p. 17. January, 1924.

DYAR, DOROTHY, *The Call of the Church to the Trained Public Speaker of Today,* Emerson Quarterly, IV, 2, p. 5. January, 1924.

WRIGHT, C. D., *High Lights on Amateur Drama Throughout the United States,* English Journal, XIII, 2, p. 125.

GENERAL EDUCATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

(Edited by GILES WILKESON GRAY, University of Illinois)

DANFORTH, RALPH E.: *Language as a Factor in Human Evolution;* Scientific Monthly, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, p. 76. January, 1924.

KEENER, E. E.: *Some Suggestions on the Technique of Teaching Pupils to Read;* Chicago Schools Journal, Vol. VI, No. 5, p. 177. January, 1924.

REIGHARD, JACOB: *The University Teaching of Speech Reading to the Adult Deafened;* School and Society, Vol. XIX, No. 473, p. 58. January 19, 1924.

TAIT, WILLIAM D.: *Motor Speech Functions in Dreams;* Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, p. 244. October-December, 1923.

VALENTINE, C. W.: *The Function of Images in the Appreciation of Poetry;* British Journal of Psychology, Vol. XIV, No. 2, p. 164. October, 1923.

WELLS, F. L.: *Vocal and Manual Mechanisms in Choice Reactions;* Journal of Experimental Psychology, Vol. VII, No. 1, p. 59. February, 1924.

NEWS AND NOTES

NEWS OF THE DEPARTMENTS

THE Department of Speech at the Northern Normal and Industrial School at Aberdeen, South Dakota, has established a Bureau of Speech Education, and has begun the regular publication of a Bulletin. The staff of the Bureau includes the three regular instructors in the Speech Department. The aim, as expressed in the first Bulletin, is: "to act as a clearing house for special local or individual problems relating to any phase of speech activity; to disseminate circulars of general interest in speech education; and to furnish an educational and entertaining lyceum service." The Bureau offers gratuitous service—which is not limited to the citizens of South Dakota—in program-making, speech-making, play and pageant production, contests and discussion meetings, speech defects, methods of teaching, and the collection of material for debates.

Quite recently a study was made of the winners of the Interstate Oratorical Association final contests. The study covered the results of the contests for twenty-eight successive years, and revealed the interesting fact that of the fifty-eight winners of first and second places, twenty, or slightly more than one-third, appear in "Who's Who in America." The list includes one author, one governor, three clergymen, including one bishop, three lawyers, two United States Representatives, two United States Senators, and eight educators. The latter group includes one dean, two professors, and five college presidents!

Speech teachers, as well as others who are more or less annoyed by continual requests to judge debates, often in remote and inaccessible towns, with no reward except the consciousness of duty

done, will be interested to know that the Michigan Intercollegiate Debating League has taken the stand that all debate judges should be paid a fee of at least ten dollars beyond their expenses. Wherever the expert judge system is used the fee is considerably higher. It is barely possible that in time to judge a debate will be considered as respectable and as important as to referee a basketball game!

Something in the nature of an innovation has been started by the Extension Department of the Bloomsburg State Normal School in Pennsylvania. Under the direction of Professor G. F. Rassweiler, extension classes in Play Production are being held in six different centers in the district near Bloomsburg. Each class meets three hours a week, either in the evening or Saturday morning, and the course receives three semester hours credit either at the State Normal School or the State College. It is planned to take the plays presented from center to center, thus making a circuit.

As the interest in college dramatics continues to grow everywhere, dramatic clubs are undertaking more and more ambitious programs.

In Galesburg, Illinois, Professor Clarence Menser, of Knox College, has carried his dramatic experiments into new fields. For the past two summers, The Galesburg Players, consisting of advanced students in his Play Production course, have presented what amounts to a season of summer stock. Plays are presented in the outdoor theatre on the Knox Campus. Six plays are presented in as many weeks, with three performances of each play. Last season's program included "Nothing But the Truth," "Seven Keys to Baldpate," "The Mollusc," "Cousin Kate," "Three Live Ghosts," and "The Truth."

The Players of Western State Normal College at Kalamazoo, Michigan, under the direction of Miss Laura Shaw, are mastering the art of "puppeteering." With the aid of the Art Department, they have constructed and dressed their own puppets, and built their puppet stage. They are now preparing for their first public puppet show, which will include "Rumpelstiltskin" and "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves." The performances will be given in the Playhouse, which the Players have transformed from an